

80d18 (1)

A
SUPPLEMENTAL APOLOGY
FOR
THE BELIEVERS
IN THE
SHAKSPEARE-PAPERS:
BEING
A REPLY
TO MR. MALONE'S ANSWER,
WHICH WAS EARLY ANNOUNCED, BUT NEVER PUBLISHED:
WITH
A DEDICATION
TO GEORGE STEEVENS, F.R.S. S.A.
AND
A POSTSCRIPT
TO T. J. MATHIAS, F.R.S. S.A.
THE AUTHOR OF THE PURSUITS OF LITERATURE.

By GEORGE CHALMERS, F.R.S. S.A.



LONDON:
Printed for THOMAS EGERTON, Whitehall.

1799.



TO GEORGE STEEVENS, F.R.S. S.A.

SIR,

I COULD not dedicate this work, which has for its principal objects *the Studies of SHAKSPEARE*, the Chronology of his Dramas, the History of the Stage, during his age, and of the Office of the Master of the Revels, to any one so fitly as to you, who are the oldest, I was going to say, the best, though not the *immaculate*, Editor of *the PLAYS* of our immortal Dramatist. For dedicating this work to you, I have another reason, which may be deemed rather *undedicator*y: While I was writing my APOLOGY, you often declared, "that I " could not possibly know any thing of Shakspeare."

I was in the act of thanking you, for some communications, when I was assured, that you daily made such declarations, with threats of chastisement. You admitted, indeed, that the object of your obloquy was a good sort of a man; but you, constantly, asked, what can he know about Shakspeare? He has written very able *Traacts upon Trade*; but, what can he know about Shakspeare? He has written an elaborate book of *Political Annals*; but, what can he know about Shakspeare? He has written several *Lives*, with knowledge, and elegance; but, what can he know about Shakspeare? In all his writings, he, certainly, gives us something new; new facts, and new principles; but, what can he

know about Shakspeare? WE are, however, prepared for him; we have our blistering plasters ready; and we will make him fore: we will teach him, by our Paragraphs, our Essays, our Epigrams, and our Reviews, what it is to write about what he cannot know.

But, you did not consider, that the man, whom you thus threatened, had been bred in the School of Adversity, and was not so easily to be made fore; that he had written much, without the vain incitement of praise, or the empty hope of profit; and had become callous to monthly criticisms, weekly essays, and daily paragraphs; because he was no stranger to the motives of those, who penned them. You did not recollect, what Johnson had taught you, that an Author may write himself down, but cannot be written down by others, unless he be wanting to himself. He who endeavours well, and is, at the same time, indifferent alike to censure, or praise, needs not fear such *cantharides* as your shop supplies.

When I was told of your daily talk, I made, in my Apology, a few remarks on your Shakspeare, by way of intimation to your shrewdness, that I had heard of your threats, without being frightened from my purpose: But, I trusted to a sagacity, which I soon perceived you did not possess. And, I have been thus obliged to address much of this Supplement to you, as an apology, for presuming, like some of the Editors of Shakspeare, to write upon that immortal poet, without much knowledge of the subject; a subject, which few have made any pretensions to understand, without incurring reproach. You have lived to enjoy the consolation of perceiving, that every contest about Shakspeare has left the readers of
that

THE DEDICATION.

that great poet, better instructed, in the nature of his studies, more filled with admiration at the extent of his genius, and better disposed to cultivate the rich garden of his poetry. Whatever there may be in this truth, I have no intention, I assure you, to interrupt any biographer's purpose of publishing a new life of Shakspeare; to inflame, by my labours, any Editor's jealousy; to rouse envy, by anticipating discovery; or to provoke malignity, by successful perseverance, in making good my points, to renew insidious attacks against me;

" ———— Maugre what might hap

" Of heavier on himself." ————

G. C.

The ADVERTISEMENT.

THE APOLOGY, to which this work is a SUPPLEMENT, had not been long published, when an answer, a *full* answer, was announced by Mr. Malone's authority. Yet, wise men said, that a book of documents, and facts, could not be answered, though it might be misconceived, and misrepresented; though the mistakes of haste might be noted, and the petty errors of the eye, rather than the understanding, might be magnified into bulk:

"As things seem large, which we through mists descry;

"*Dulness* is ever apt to magnify."

What was thus foreseen has actually happened. At the end of two years, no answer has appeared, though a kind of *bush-fighting* has been kept up against the apologist, by news-paper paragraphs, magazine essays, and monthly criticisms. Knowing that my refutation of Mr. Malone's Inquiry could not be shaken, by distant skirmishing, I never heeded this insidious warfare.

At length, Mr. Malone has become sensible of what others could have told him, that as a general he had pushed his army too far into the enemy's territories; and had exposed himself to be attacked with advantage, in front, in flank, and in rear. He was thus attacked. And he silently retreated from a country, where he found, that he could neither maintain an inch of ground, nor acquire an atom of glory. Knowing the motives of
his

his retreat, I have chosen to adopt the policy of the Constable Montmorencie, who erected a golden bridge, for the retiring foe, rather than to imitate the imprudence of Gaston de Foix, who continued to pursue, till he fell in the field: Influenced by *the Constable's* policy, I have, in this Supplement, accordingly, turned aside, from Mr. Malone, to some of those, who have since come into the field, not so much to cover his retreat, as to annoy his antagonist.

Mean while, Mr. Steevens, who had disavowed any purpose of interfering, chose rather to lend his aid to the management of ambuscade, than to use the open hostilities of magnanimous war. The repulses, which I have herein given to his attacks, may perhaps induce him to think, in the end, that *honesty is the best policy*.

The meddler, Mathias, must mingle too in the fray, without any pretence of past injury, or motive of future good: His petulance has provoked me to let fall my *leadén mace* upon him; as, I trust, he will feel in my *postscript*.

But, although I may have repulsed all those aggressors; although I may have confuted the enquirer himself, still the *Miscellaneous Papers*, which gave rise to this controversy, remain unsupported by me. At the time I wrote my Apology, I had *particular reasons*, for thinking them to be *supposititious*: Nay, I expressly acknowledged them to be *spurious*, by my prefatory advertisement. A criminal may be guilty; yet, the proofs, which are brought by the prosecutor, may be defective in their forms, and inconclusive in their inferences.

I have

I have tried, in this *Supplement*, to strengthen what is weak, to correct what is erroneous, and to supply what is defective, in my *Apology*. The admirers of Shakspeare, I trust, will find, that something has been added, while nothing has been taken away: The biographer of the poet, the commentator on his writings, the historian of the stage, will all be supplied with dates, and details, and facts, which will facilitate the further cultivation of a field, which was ere while over run by the briars of false criticism, and obstructed by the weeds of wild conjecture.

I now retire from a controversy, which was rather provoked by others, than sought by me; leaving the *biographer* to publish the promised life of Shakspeare; the *commentator* to amend his own errors; and the *lampooner* to feed upon his appropriate malignity: I leave them all to gratify their several pursuits, without any further interruption from me.

G. C.

* * The ornament of the title page is the Crest of Shakspeare; the *tail-piece* is his Arms; and they were both emblazoned by the skilful hand of Francis Townsend, the Windsor Herald, from the Declaration of Arms, which was given to the Poet's Father in 1599.

SUPPLEMENTAL APOLOGY

BELIEVERS

SUPPOSITIOUS SHAKSPEARE PAPERS.

THE INTRODUCTION.

WHILST Mr. Malone was busily employed, in trying to discover, by means of his friends, those of the Believers, who were most likely to answer his Enquiry, I often said, that, feeble as his powers were, he would easily overcome the opponent of whatever talents, who should attempt to vindicate the genuineness of the Shakspeare-papers; because, falsehood, however supported, cannot stand with truth.

But, it was equally apparent, that Mr. Malone's Enquiry, as it partook much of the qualities of the *suppositious papers*, was equally with those papers, subject to confutation, by opposing facts to fictions. So often did I re-

peat this sentiment, that I found myself, at length, in some manner pledged to answer what was deemed by the superficial, to be decisive, and by the thoughtless, to be unanswerable. In accomplishing this object, I seized upon the strong ground of an explicit avowal, that *The Miscellaneous Papers*, which had been exhibited as Shakspeare's, were *spurious* (a). By this explicit avowal, that the exhibition of those *Miscellanies* was a cheat, Mr. Malone was deprived of his strength, like Antæus of other times, who was no longer strong, than while he could touch his mother earth. From that *vantage ground*, it was not difficult to expose the Enquirer's petulance, and to confute his fictions; to vindicate our Archæology from his misrepresentations, and to defend the independence of the Republic of Letters against his attacks (b).

Such
(a) See the Prefatory advertisement to *The Apology*, which was written for this very purpose.

(b) Mr. Malone lays it down as a *fixed principle*, "that the authenticity, or spuriousness, of the poems attributed to Rowley cannot be decided by any person who has not a taste for English poetry, and, a moderate, at least, if not a critical, knowledge of the compositions of most of our poets, from the time of Chaucer to that of Pope. Such a [an] one is, in my opinion, a competent judge of this matter; and were a jury of twelve such persons empanelled

Such were the important objects, which remained to be accomplished, after the *Miscellaneous Papers* had been, positively, acknowledged to be spurious: and, those objects will be for ever interesting to liberal minds, so long as personal character shall be deemed worthy of defence; as literary questions remain to be answered; and whilst the independence of the learned world shall be thought equally entitled to support, as freedom is, in political society. All these points may be fairly discussed, without much recollection of an *exploded cheat*, whilst, at the same time, the character of Shakespeare may be, incidentally, vindicated, his writings elucidated, and his fame extended; which are all subjects, not only very interesting in themselves, but are also connected, intimately, with our national character.

"nelled to try the question, I have not the smallest doubt
" what would be their almost instantaneous decision."

[See his *Cursory Observations* on the poems attributed to Thomas Rowley, 1782. p. 2.] Such is the spirit of domination, which is assumed as a principle over all persons, except the chosen few, who have a fancied taste; and who alone, in the opinion of Mr. Malone, are qualified to decide a question of fact, like other facts of full as much importance. That spirit is still stalking abroad, in the learned world; frightening all, who are to be frightened by spirits; and insulting all, who are supposed to be unable to resist attack, or unwilling to resent injury. I allude, here, to Thomas James Mathias, with his *Pursuits of Literature*.

— § I. —

THE GENERAL ARGUMENT.

Thousands there are, indeed, who, with some pretensions to science, and many attainments in literature, neither trouble themselves about Shakspeare, nor much care for our Archaiology: They have a privilege in their indifference; a title to their own pursuits; and a kind of charter, for the freedom of enjoying these rights, safe from the stroke of satire, and free from the sneer of reprehension. But, whether the admirers of Shakspeare be *chartered libertines*; whether our poet's editors, be entitled to those immunities of indifference, may admit of some doubt. It can admit of no doubt, however, whether an editor of that illustrious dramatist, "who had announced a "Life of Shakspeare, either in folio, quarto, or "octavo;" who had offered a fresh edition of his Dramas, in fifteen volumes, royal quarto, after so many other editions had been published, with a greater, or less, success, during the last thirty years, may hear of Shakspeare with indifference; or sit down, heedlessly, when new Songs of *Avon's Swan* are proposed to be carolled, to listening ears. If such an editor should attempt to teach what he has never learned himself, the indifference, which was
innocent

innocent in others, becomes criminal in him.

With such an editor,

“Indifference, clad in Wisdom’s guise,

All fortitude of mind supplies.”

But, when indifference, clad in the disguise of wisdom, comes out upon the stage to hiss at curiosity, to despise inquiry, and to lampoon character, it then becomes an object, for scorn to point at, a mark, for ridicule to expose, and for reprehension to chastise: and, when it is considered, that the same affected indifference had already roused curiosity, with regard to Shakspeare, and urged research to inquire for Shakspearean *treasure trove*, its scoffs, and its scepticism, must be left for disdain to deride, as the tricks of a zany, rather than for philosophy to hold up to contempt as the follies of a critic. During the infancy of criticism, far different was the critical philosophy of Spenser, which he inculcated, in 1590, when answering, by *anticipation*, our Enquirer’s objections:

“But, let that man with better sense advise,

That of the world least part to us is *hid*:

And daily how, throw hardy enterprize,

Many great regions, are discovered,

Which, to late age, were never mentioned.

Who ever heard of the Indian Peru?

Or who in ventrous vessel measured

The *Amazons* huge river now found true?

Or fruitfulest *Virginia* who did ever view?

Yet all these were, when no man did them know;
 Yet have from wisest ages hidden been:
 And later times more unknown things shall show.
 Why, then, should WITLESS man so much mis-ween.
 That nothing is, but that which he hath seen?
 What if within the moon's fair shining sphere,
 What if in every star unseen,
 Of other worlds he happily should hear?
 He wonder would much more, yet, *such to some appear.* (c)¹

Thus are we taught, in charming poetry, to expect every thing from *hardy enterprize*, and to condemn the *witless man*, who should conceive, that *nothing is, but that which he hath seen*: And thus doth the seer foretel, how, later times more unknown things shall show. What incitements have we here to answer every inquiry by the investigation of facts, rather than by the inculcation of theory. Yet, ages elapsed before the true mode of criticising Shakspeare was either practised or acknowledged: And, in our own days, an attempt has been made to draw the life, and character, of a most illustrious poet, from his writings, rather than from documents (d).

Far

(c) See the proem to the Second Book of the Faerie Queen, which was first published, in 1590.

(d) As an example how much more is to be obtained, by collecting facts, than by dwelling on theories, I beg leave to lay before the reader an unedited Proclamation about MILTON:

*

By

Far different were the principle, and practice
of the Believers, from the scepticism, and inacti-
tivity

By the King.

A Proclamation for calling in and suppressing of two
Books written by John Milton, the one intituled;
Johannis Miltoni Angli pro Populo Anglicano De-
fensio contra Claudii Anonymi alias Salmasii, Defen-
sionem Regiam; And the other in answer to a Book
intituled, The Pourtraicture of His Sacred Majestie in
His Solitudes and Sufferings: And also a Third Book,
intituled, The obstructers of Justice, written by John
Goodwin.

Charles R.

Whereas John Milton late of Westminster, in the County
of Middlesex, hath published in print two severall Books;
the one intituled, Johannis Miltoni Angli pro Populo An-
glicano Defensio, contra Claudii Anonymi alias Salmasii,
Defensionem Regiam: And the other in answer to a Book,
intituled, The Pourtraicture of His sacred Majestie in His
Solitudes and Sufferings. In both which are contained sun-
dry treasonable passages against Vs and Our Government,
and most impious endeavours to justifie the horrid and un-
matchable Murder of Our late dear Father of glorious Me-
mory.

And whereas John Goodwin, late of Coleman-street
London, Clerk, hath also published in print, a Book, inti-
tuled, The obstructers of Justice, written in defence of the
Traiterous sentence against His late Majesty. And whereas
the said John Milton and John Goodwin are both fled, or
so obscure themselves, that no endeavours used for their ap-
prehension can take effect, whereby they might be brought
to legal Tryal, and deservedly receive condign punishment
for their Treasons and Offences: Now to the end that Our
good Subjects may not be corrupted in their judgments with

A SUPPLEMENTAL APOLOGY [THE GENERAL
tivity of the *witless man*. They assumed ex-
perience, for their principle; and adopted en-
terprize,

such wicked and Traiterous principles, as are dispersed and scattered throughout the before mentioned Books; We, upon the motion of the Commons in Parliament now assembled do hereby strictly charge and command all and every person and persons whatsoever, who live in any City, Borough, or Town Incorporate within this our Kingdom of England, the Dominion of Wales, and Town of Berwick upon Tweed, in whose hands any of those Books are or hereafter shall be, That they, upon pain of our high displeasure, and the consequence thereof; do forthwith upon publication of this Our command or within Ten dayes immediately following, deliver, or cause the same to be delivered, to the Mayor, Bailiffs, or other Chief Officer or Magistrate in any of the said Cities, Boroughs, or Towns Incorporate, where such person or persons so live; or, if living out of any City, Borough, or Town Incorporate, then to the next Justice of Peace adjoining to his or their dwelling or place of abode; or if living in either of Our Universities then to the Vice-Chancellor of that University where he or they do reside.

And in default of such voluntary delivery, which We do expect in observance of our said Command, That then and after the time before limited expired, the said Chief Magistrate of all every the said Cities, Boroughs, or Towns Incorporate, the Justices of the Peace in their severall Counties, and the Vice-Chancellors of Our said Universities respectively, are hereby Comanded to seize and take all and every the Books aforesaid, in whose hands or possession soever they shall be found, and certifie the names of the offenders unto Our Privy-Council.

And we do hereby also give special charge and command to the said Chief Magistrates, Justices of the Peace, and Vice-Chancellors,

terprize, for their practice. They knew, from
 "less reading than makes felons 'scape," that
 almost

Chancellors, respectively, That they cause the said Books
 which shall be so brought unto any of their hands, or seized,
 or taken as aforesaid, by vertue of this Our Proclamation,
 to be delivered to the respective Sheriffs of those Counties
 where they respectively live, the first and next Assizes that
 shall after happen. And the said Sheriffs are hereby also
 required, in time of holding such Assizes, to cause the same
 to be publickly burnt by the hands of the Common Hang-
 man.

And we do further strightly charge and Command, That
 no Man hereafter presume to Print, Vend, Sel, or Disperse
 any the aforesaid Books, upon pain of Our heavy displea-
 sure, and of such further punishment, as for their presump-
 tion, in that behalf may any way be inflicted upon them by
 the Laws of this Realm.

Given at Our Court at Whitehall the 13th of August,
 in the Twelfth Year of Our Reign, 1660.

Burnet supposes, that Milton was forgotten, at the Resto-
 ration: Johnson says, that he was ordered to be prosecuted,
though perhaps not very diligently pursued. It appears from
 the Commons' Journal 8 vol. p. 66. that the King was ad-
 dressed to issue his Proclamation, for calling in Milton's two
 Pamphlets; that the Attorney General was ordered by the
 Commons to cause *effectual proceedings* to be had against
 John Milton; it was resolved by the House, that Mr. Milton
 be sent for in Custody, by the Serjeant at Arms.—I have lodg-
 ed the *original* Proclamation, which was founded on the Re-
 solves of Parliament, in the British Museum, for the benefit
 of the public. I will only add, for removing all suspicion,
 that it was republished in the News-papers of those times:
 I have a Copy of it, which was reprinted in *Mercurius Pub-*
licus,

almost every notice about Shakspeare had been discovered by investigation, rather than found by intuition. They had been taught, by Mr. Malone himself, that many documents, with regard to the illustrious bard, were yet to be disclosed by time. They saw with *fond* eyes, perhaps, discoveries daily made, in respect to to his Life, and Writings, which did not gratify curiosity, so much as animate hope. And they inferred from experience, that what had often happened might again happen; that, as discoveries generally reproduce discoveries, they were as much led by expectation, as induced by reason, to conclude, that the announced books, Dramas, and papers, of the exhibiter, were the "expected fragments," which had been foretold by *our Seer* :

" ——— Expectation was almost ready to faint ;

" Longing for what it had not."

Whatever might be the expectation of some of the Believers, or the hope of others, they all applied the same rules of investigation to those books, and Dramas, papers, and paintings, which direct them in the ordinary affairs of life. They made use of the evidence of their

licus, from Wednesday August 15th to Wednesday August 22d 1660. Why will not biographers search for such documents ? We want more facts ; not more theories, and declamations ! !

senses,

senses, which assist them in matters of more interest; some of them, indeed, with greater discernment, and circumspection, and some of them, with less. It was sufficient for them, that they had, on their side, "PROBABILITY; which, bishop Butler had assured them," is the very GUIDE of *Life* (e). They examined the evidence, *external*, and *internal*, which was laid before them (f): And, on the

(e) Bishop Halifax's Edition of *The Analogy*, p. 3.

(f) Amidst a million of mistakes, Mr. Malone confounded the nature of *external*, and *internal*, evidence, [See his Enquiry, p. 17, and the Apology for the Believers, 22-3.] From our Critic's practice, very differently taught the Diplomats of the Benedictin Congregation of S. Maur. In treating of the characters of Charters, *extrinsic* and *intrinsic*, Dom. de Vaines says, that, "Les Caracteres EXTRINSE-
"QUES des Chartes sont, les figures des lettres qui y sont
"employées, la forme & la matiere des Sceaux qui y sont
"apposés, and les matieres sur laquelle & avec lesquelles
"on a écrit les diplomes ou actes quelconques, ce qui com-
"prend instrument dont on s'est servi pour écrire, la li-
"queur q'on a employée pour faire sortir les lettres, &
"la matiere subjective de l'écriture:—Les caracteres IN-
"TRINSEQUES qui sont des signes si évidents de supposition
"ou de vérité, d'authenticité ou de suspicion, sont, le style
"propre aux chartes, les différentes manières successives
"d'orthographier le langage employé dans les chartes, les
"différentes époques de l'usage de pluriels & des singu-
"liers, les titres d'honneur pris & donnés dans le souscrip-
"tions des chartes les noms & surnoms & le nombre dis-
"tingués

the whole examination, the Believers were induced, by what they had seen, to conclude, with Bishop Butler, "that in questions of difficulty, or such as are thought so, where more satisfactory evidence cannot be had, or is not seen; if the result of examination be, that there appears upon the whole, any the lowest presumption, on the one side, and none, on the other, or a greater presumption, on one side, though in the lowest degree greater; this determines the question, even in matters of speculation; and in matters of practice, will lay us under an absolute and formal obligation, in point of prudence and of interest, to act upon that presumption or low probability, though it be so low as to leave the mind in very great doubt which is the truth (g)." Thus argued
Bishop

"tinctif des Princes de même nom les diverses invocations tant explicites que cachées les adresses, les débuts, les préambules avec leurs clauses, tant dérogatoires que comminatoires, les salutations ou l'adieu final, les formules générales, les annonces de précaution, les dates, les signatures, &c. &c. &c." [See *Dictionnaire Raisonné de Diplomatique*: Tome Premier, p. 257.]

(g) Bishop Butler's Analogy, which was republished by Bishop Halifax, p. 3.—Yet, is it said, in opposition to those great authorities, by an anonymous writer in a monthly miscellany, called *The British Critic* [vol. ix. p. 514.] "When
" Mr.

Bishop Butler, when supporting Religion; thus reasoned Mr. Locke, when investigating the

" Mr. C. puts the *probabilities* on which these *papry papers* were believed by a few, on the footing with those which regulate justice, and form the foundation of religious faith, WE stand astonished at his *indiscretion*." Since this attack on me, on the score of religion, I have read Butler's *Analogy*, and Locke on *The Understanding*, which before I had never read: I am more confirmed in my judgment, that I was perfectly correct, in my principle of reasoning, and perfectly prudent, in my application of it. I will repeat from *Wilkins*, that, " Things of several kinds may admit, and require several sorts of proofs, all which may be good in their kinds: and, therefore, nothing can be more irrational, than for a man to doubt of, or to deny, the truth of any thing; because it cannot be made out, by such kind of proofs, of which the nature of such thing is not capable." Thus reasoned Wilkins! And I was, by his argument, induced to add: " These reasonings apply more forcibly to Religion than to Law: The leading articles of our faith do not admit of rigid demonstration: rational probability is, in these, the strongest proof, which can be given to induce belief, without deluding our understandings with the suggestions of *possibility*, or entangling our convictions with the *sophisms of infidelity*." [Apology, 19, 20.] I will, moreover, repeat, that the said Anonymous Critic, no doubt, thinks, that he can argue about religion more rationally than Tillotson and Wilkins, than Butler and Halifax. But, a Law Lord is quoted, as reasoning differently from me, about the rules of evidence. Is there any Law Lord, who demands *demonstration* in the administration of Justice; or any other evidence than the nature of the case allows; who *presumes fraud*, in the first instance;

the philosophy of the Understanding (*b*); and, thus taught Chief Baron Gilbert, when laying down the law of Evidence (*i*).

It was, however, reserved for Mr. Malone, and for those, who support his scepticism, by their paragraphs, their essays, and their reviews, to expect *demonstration* in the affairs of life, and in the history of *facts*, before they give any judgment about the facts themselves! Yes; the Believers were ultimately deceived in their object, by their own energies, and disappointed, in their reasonable hopes, by *fallible proofs*; as other men are sometimes deceived in their judgments, by their senses, and disappointed often in their projects, by their reasonings: Yet, mankind must, in the affairs of life, trust to the evidence of their senses; and, in their judgment about facts, must rely on their powers of ratiocination; instance; who forms his judgment, upon the point in question, like the Commentators, and Critics, without any inquiry at all; or who, like them, prefers second rate evidence, to first rate; or who like them too, would rather listen to *hearsay* witnesses, than trust to the examination of his own senses?

(*b*) See Locke concerning the *Human Understanding*, the 20th Edition, the Chapter "of Probability; which is the appearance of agreement upon fallible proofs."

(*i*) The Treatise on the Law of Evidence, p. 1-5.

though

though disappointment be the reward of their efforts; and though *scepticism* may refuse to act, or to think; because he may fail in his steps, or be deceived in his opinion. Geographers long expected the discovery of the *Southern Continent*, which our great navigator, Cooke, failed to discover, notwithstanding his consummate skill, and obstinate perseverance. But, neither philosophy, nor presumption, though disappointed in finding what was not to be found, ever objected to the propriety of the trial, or to the efforts of perseverance, when conducted both by prudence, and science. Yet, active curiosity may discover something in the possibilities of time, place, and circumstance; but, heedless inaction can find nothing, while *wisdom is consumed in confidence*. The Believers were accordingly right, in their mode of inquiry, and were only led into error, by their systematic principles: Their opponents, the Sceptics, were only right by accident: If fortuitous events furnish a rational principle, for conducting daily affairs;—

“Then, any thing might come from any thing:”

“For, how from chance can constant order spring?”

— § II. —

QUEEN ELIZABETH; AND HER LETTER.

The obstinacy of dogmatism is such, that confutation cannot convince it: Of Queen Elizabeth,

Elizabeth, conceitedness often remarked, with the confidence of certainty, that, such was her loftiness, *she disdained to correspond with much greater men than Shakspeare.* This objection was even repeated by self-sufficient folly, after it had been proved, by a thousand documents, that she corresponded, constantly, with her male servants, and gossiped, familiarly, with her female attendants; that she personally thanked Lambard, for his book; and pensioned Spenser, for his flatteries: Yet, are there Critics, who declare, “that I have not fully “ proved it *probable*, that a letter might be “ written by that Sovereign to Shakspeare!” I know not, if this confidence can be shamed into silence, by a letter from her Secretary, Sir Robert Cecil, to Sir John Harrington; which says, “that the blessed Queen was more than “ a man, and, in troth, sometimes less than a “ woman (*k*).” The character of that extraordinary princess will continue to be discussed, long after her notorious epistle to Shakspeare shall be ranked with the figments of her flatterers; and shall be justly condemned, with the other forgeries of her reign.

(*k*) See this very curious epistle, which is dated the 29th May 1603, in the *Nuga Antiqua*, Edit. 1779, vol. ii. p. 263.

Of that accomplished Statesman, who knew her perfectly, it was said, (*l*) that if he were born in 1550, he was not a *youth*, in 1602. This remark was thus doubtfully expressed, from the avowal of a late Biographer, that he could never discover, when Sir Robert Cecil was born (*m*). What the Biographer's diligence could not find, my perseverance has traced: Burleigh, amidst all his cares for the state, left behind him a statement of the dates, when his wife was delivered of all her children, which Strype has preserved; and which shows, that the birth of his Son Robert, was on the 1st of June 1563 (*n*). What a resplendent period! Spencer was born in 1553; Bacon, Lord Verulam, was born in 1562; Cecil, Lord Salisbury, in 1563; and Shakespeare in 1564. Every notice, about those extraordinary men, is so interwoven with the story of that great Queen, as to form an interesting portion of her character. Of Eliza-

(*l*) The Apology, 38.

(*m*) Dr. Kippis, in the New Biog. Brit. vol. iii. p. 404.

(*n*) Strype's Annals, 4 vol. 338. This date proves, that Mr. Secretary Cecil was still under *forty*, in September 1602; and was even yet an object of Elizabeth's jealousy. See a very remarkable specimen of the Queen's *jealousy*, and *frolicsomeness* in The Apology, 37.

beth it has been, truly, said, that she wrote,
 when she was young, a fine print-like hand;
 that she greatly enlarged her writing, as she
 grew older: But, it has not yet been shown,
 that she could not write, legibly, when she
 became aged; owing to the failure of her
 nerves; a disorder, which carried her to the
 grave. The same Secretary of State has fur-
 nished a proof of that curious particular, when
 he wrote to Lord Mountjoy, the Lord Deputy
 of Ireland, in July 1602; saying in his post-
 script: "Because I am not sure, whether you
 " can perfectly reade her Majestie's hande, I
 " send you the same in a copy, *the latter part*
 " whereof, being futeable to the former stile
 " of favour, that was wont to passe betweene
 " you, grew by the occasion of your owne Post-
 " script, when you wrote to the Treasurer
 " that you had been a good while in O'Neil's
 " kitchen, which you meant to warm so well,
 " as he should keep the worse fiers ever
 " after (o)." The *latter part* of the Queen's
 Letter to the Lord Deputy, before referred
 to, contains the odd expressions following:
 " We have forgotten to praise your humility,
 " that after having beene a *Queene's kitchen*

(o) Moryson's Itinerary, 1617, p. 230.

" maide,

"maide, you have not disdained to be a *trait-*
 "tor's Skullion. God bleſſe you with perfe-
 "verance.—Your Sovereaigne, E. R. (p)." We may herein ſee, as in a mirror, how Elizabeth could condeſcend, even to buffoonery. In a former letter to the ſame great Officer, ſhe had written full as familiarly, but not ſo unintelligibly, as to require a Commentator:—
 "My faithful George, If ever more ſervice of
 "worth were performed in ſhorter ſpace then
 "you have done, we are deceived among many
 "eye witneſſes: We have received the fruit
 "thereof, and bid you faithfully credit, that
 "that what ſo wit, courage, or care may do,
 "we truly find, they have all been thoroughly
 "acted in all your charge. And for the ſame
 "beleewe, that it ſhall neither be unremem-
 "bered, nor unrewarded, and in mean while
 "beleewe my help nor prayers ſhall never fail
 "you.—Your Sovereaigne that beſt regards
 "you, E. R. (q)." In return, the Lord Deputy ſhewed Elizabeth, that he could not only perform great actions, for her ſervice, but could ſpeak ſugred words, for her gratification. He wrote her *ſacred Maieſtie*, who was then

(p) Moryſon's Itinerary, 1617, p. 228.

(q) Ib. 133.

sixty-eight:—" When I have done all that I
 " can, the uttermost effects of my labours doe
 " appeare so little to my owne zeale to doe
 " more, that I am often ashamed to present
 " them unto your *faire*, and royall, *eyes*.—I
 " beseeche your Majestie to thinke, that in a
 " matter of so great importance, my affection
 " will not suffer me to commit so grosse a fault
 " against your service, as to doe any thing, for
 " the which I am not able to give you a very
 " good account, the which above all things,
 " I desire to do at your *owne royall feete*, and
 " that your service here, may give me leave to
 " *fill my eyes* with their onely *deare* and *desired*
 " *object*. I beseech God confound all your
 " enemies and unfaithful subjects, and make
 " my hand as happy, as my heart is zealous to
 " doe you service.—Your Majestie's truest
 " servant, MOUNT JOY." (r) These letters, with
 the illustrations of them, which have passed into
 history, indeed, would, alone, exhibit the true
 character of Elizabeth, although our anecdote-
 writers do not see, either her genuine portrait, or
 the vivid lights, wherein it was placed. What

(r) Moryson's Itinerary, 1617, p. 233.—It is to be remembered, that this *love-letter* of Lord Deputy Mountjoy was addressed to Queen Elizabeth, at the Age of *Sixty-eight*.

blindness could not see, nor folly comprehend, is now apparent to the world, viz. that Elizabeth, who *was often more than a man, and sometimes less than a woman*, could be very familiar at times; and had a voracious appetite for praise, which all her Servants, and Strangers, were studious to gratify, by the most servile adulation: Yet, this is the Queen, who, as we are told by the Commentators, would not condescend to write to Shakspeare!

Among the adulators of Elizabeth, Spenser, and Shakspeare, appear to have known her character, fully, and to have gratified, successfully, her desire of commendation. As these first-rate poets will ere long be brought nearer to each other, than has yet been done by Critics, it will be necessary to dwell a little upon the life, and writings, of Spenser; as they will exhibit Shakspeare under a new aspect. I mean to prove 1st, that Spenser addressed his *Amoretti* to Elizabeth; 2dly, that Shakspeare was ambitious of emulating Spenser; and 3dly, that Shakspeare was thus induced to address *his Sonnets* to the same Queen.

The life of Spenser has been often written, but never with much effort, and always with

many misrepresentations. That this great Poet was born in London has been generally asserted, without contradiction; yet, I have not been able, by the offer of a reward, which was deemed sufficiently liberal by the parish-clerks, to trace his baptism in the parochial (s) registers of London. He was, probably, born about the year 1553: For, his *Amoretti*, which were certainly published, in 1595, and probably written, in 1593, speak, in the sixtieth Sonnet, of the year of writing them being longer, —

“Than all those *forty*, which my life outwent,

The poet's frequent boasts of the respectability of his family have induced Biographers to regard him, as a Scion of the ancient stem in Northamptonshire; yet, I could not find, by my searches in the College of Arms, though I was obligingly assisted by the very intelligent, Francis Townsend, Windsor-Herald, that any of the Pedigrees of the Spensers recognize every body's Spenser, as connected with them (t): From the silence about Spenser,

(s) The Parish Registers of the City of about the period of Spenser's birth have generally disappeared; owing to various causes; as I was told by the Parish-Clerks.

(t) Speaking, in his *Colin Clout*, of the three daughters of Sir John Spenser of Althorpe; namely, Elizabeth, Lady Cary,

fer, which the Herald's books preserve, I suspect, that his father must have died before the Son had risen to eminence, by the products of his genius. Neither do the records of the University contain any notice of his parentage; though they indicate, that his father was not opulent, when they record the matriculation of Spenser as a *Sizer*. He entered at Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, in 1569; he proceeded batchelor of Arts, in 1572; and master of Arts, in 1576 (*u*). It was at the University, that he became acquainted with Gabriel Harvey, who introduced him to Sir Philip Sydney; and by the recommendation

Cary, Anne, Lady Compton, and Alice, Lady Strange, he says:—

“ Ne less praise worthy are the Sister's thrae,

“ The honour of the noble familie,

“ *Of which, I meanest*, boast myself to be

“ And most, that unto them, I am so nigh.”

(*u*) The Register of Pembroke Hall does not go further back than 1620; But, having engaged an accurate friend to search the University record, He found, that Edmond Spencer [The name is also spelt Spenser] was entered a *Sizer* of Pembroke Hall, on the 20th of May 1569; received his degree of Batchelor of Arts on the 16th of January 1572; and his Master of Arts Degree, on the 26th of June 1576. There are in Pembroke Hall two pictures of Spenser: yet, is he almost forgotten there, as an *alumnus*.

of this universal patron of genius (*v*), Spenser was received into the family, and service of the Earl of Leicester, by whom he was appointed his Agent in foreign Countries, during the year 1579. It was in this year, that he first shewed the world his powers of poetry, by the publication of his *Shepherd's Calendar* (*w*). He appears to have even then formed the plan, and to have composed part of *The faerie Queene*.

At what time of his life he married, or whom he married, cannot be ascertained, though he has told us himself, in 1595, that his wife's name was Elizabeth, as his mother's name had been.

When he left the house of the Earl of Leicester, in 1580, he became private Secretary to Lord Grey of Wilton, on his appointment to the high office, of Lord Deputy of Ire-

(*v*) In his Dedication of his *Ruins of Time*, in 1591, "Sithens his late coming into England, to the celebrated Countess of Pembroke, Spenser, says that Sir Philip Sydney, her brother, "was the patron of my Young Muses."

(*w*) On the 5th of December 1579 was entered in the Stationers' Registers, for Hugh Singelton, "The Shepherd's Calendar Conteyninge xii eclogs, proportionable to the xii Monethes." It was assigned to John Harrison, junior, on the 18th of October 1580.

land.

land. Spenser afterwards spoke of Lord Grey, as *the patron of his Muse's pupillage*; as *the pillar of his life*. Lord Grey was succeeded by Sir John Perrot in 1583: Yet, Spenser seems to have kept up his connection with Ireland; having obtained, in 1586 (x), in conjunction with Raleigh, and other adventurers, a Grant of three thousand acres of forfeited lands, with the Castle of Kilcolman, which had belonged to the attainted Earl of Desmond.

In the Castle of Kilcolman, Spenser probably settled, like other married men, in a family way; and, in this retreat, he certainly finished his *Faerie Queene*; as he speaks, in his Sonnet to Lord Grey, of his

"Rude rymes, the which a *rustic Muse* did weave,
In *Salvage Soil*, far from *Parnasso Mount*."

At the end of ten years, appeared, in 1590 (y),

(x) At the Conclusion of Gabriel Harvey's *Four proper Letters* there is a Sonnet by Spenser to Harvey, dated at *Dublin*, the 18th of July, 1586, which has never been reprinted till now.

(y) On the 1st of December 1589; was entered in the Stationers' Registers for Mr. Ponsonby, "*The fayre Queene* dysposed into xii books;" being licensed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and both the Wardens.

the

the three first books of the never to be forgotten *Faerie Queene* :—

————— “Nature here
Wantons, as in her prime, and plays at will
Her Virgin fancies, pouring forth more sweets ;
Wild above rule, or art, enormous blifs !”

Amidst this *enormous blifs*, Queen Elizabeth was celebrated, in the Introduction to each book, with such encomiastic enthusiasm, as the eloquent pen of such a poet could endite. Her principal Courtiers were also praised in prefatory Sonnets. It was an age of adulation ; and we may easily suppose, that the poet, who greatly excelled in the powers of panegyrick, would be suitably rewarded : In fact, a pension was conferred on Spenser, in February 1590, of fifty pounds, a year, for life, without any official duty (z). The publication of this immortal poem enabled him to renew his old friendships in England ;

(z) The world is indebted to the diligence of Mr. Malone for the discovery of this important fact in the Pat. Roll of the 33d Elizabeth p. 3. I say *important fact* ; because it establishes truth, in opposition to falsehood ; it frees the memory of Burleigh from much obloquy ; it shows, that Spenser never could have been in great want : For fifty pounds a year went far in the affairs of life, during those frugal times : But, he never was poet Laureat, as the Biographers assert, though he talks, in his *Amoretti*, of having the *Laurel*.

though

though his home was in Ireland. In 1591, was published by Ponsonbie a miscellaneous collection of poems, which he entitled *Complaints* (a), while the Poet was on his *voyage beyond Sea*: And whilst the impresson of his favourable reception in England was yet strong on his spirits, he wrote his *Colin Clouts come home again* (b); wherein he praises Raleigh for his "singular favours," and celebrates Elizabeth's bounty; "*Great Cynthia's goodness, and high grace.*" Indeed, *Great Cynthia* seems to have been always uppermost in his mind; Whatever he published, the never

(a) Ponsonbie, the Bookseller, says in the Preface, that since the Faerie Queene had found a *favourable passage*, he had endeavoured, by all good means, to get into his hands such small poemes of the same author's, as he had heard were dispersed abroad in sundrie hands, and not easie to be come by, by himself; some of them having bene purloyned from him, *since his departure beyond Sea*. This expresseion shows, that Spenser returned to Ireland, early in 1591. Ponsonbie begged the gentle Reader "graciousslie to entertaine the *new Poet.*" In one of those Poems, *The Ruines of Time*, he spoke of Camden, as *the nourice of antiquitie*;

"Camden, though time all monuments obscure,

"Yet, thy just labours ever shall endure."

(b) Spenser dated his epistle dedicatorie to Raleigh "from my house of Kilcolman, the 27th of December 1591:" Yet, the book was not published till 1595. He thanked Raleigh "for his singular favours, and sundry good turnes, shewed to him, at his *late being in England.*"

failed

failed to come in for a full share of celebration. This great poet now sat down to finish the second part of *The Faerie Queene*, and to endite his *Amoretti* (c): The first, comprehending the fourth, fifth, and sixth books, was published, in 1596 (d); the second consisting of his Sonnets, were printed in 1595.

Much

(c) On the 19th of November 1594, was entered for William Ponsonbye in the Stationers' Registers, a poem, entitled, *Amoretti* and Epithalamion, written *not long since* by Edmond Spenser: on the 20th January 1595-6, was entered for the same bookseller the second parte of the *Faery Queene*, containing the 4th, 5th, and 6th books.

(d) Of this great performance, he speaks feelingly in Sonnet LXXX:—

“ After so long a race as I have run,
 “ Through *Faerie Land*, which those *six books* compile,
 “ Give leave to rest me, being *half foredun*,
 “ And gather to myself new breath a while.
 “ Then, as a steed refreshed after toil,
 “ Out of my prison, I will break anew,
 “ And stoutly will that *second Work* assail,
 “ With strong endeavour and attention due.
 “ Till then, give leave to me, in pleasant mew
 “ To sport my muse, and sing my love's sweet praise,
 “ The contemplation of whose heavenly hew,
 “ My spirit to an higher pitch will raise:
 “ But, let her praises yet be low and mean,
 “ Fit for the handmaid of the *Faerie Queene*.

We may, herein, see how Spenser was fatigued with the long race through *Faerie Land*! And, we may thence infer,

Much of mystery has always been connected with the *Amoretti* of Spenser. When they were printed; on what occasion they were written; and to whom they were addressed; are questions, which have never been satisfactorily answered. The Biographers, who appear neither to have seen the entry of it in the Stationers' Registers, nor the book, speak of its having been published, in 1592; but the Stationers' Registers, the *title page*, and the coincidence of circumstances, prove, that it was published in 1595 (e). The biographers assume

fer, that he never wrote that *second work* which was to consist of six additional books in continuance: He never wrote more on this *faerie* theme, I think, than the *two Cantos of Mutability* which were afterwards printed, as a *Seventh book*. He wrote, as is supposed, his *View of the State of Ireland*, in 1596; when, he appears to have been in England. The opening of his *View of Ireland*, speaks of it as the Country, "Whence you [himself] lately came." He soon after published his *Four Hymns*, which he dedicated, to Margaret, the Countess of Cumberland, and to Mary, the Countess of Warwick, in an Epistle, that he dated from Greenwich, on the 1st September 1596.

(e) Herb. Typ. An. 2 v. p. 1275. I have a Copy of the *Amoretti*, which I bought at the late Doctor Farmer's Sale; and on which, he has bestowed a MS Note; in order to prove that this Copy [1595] was the *first* Edition, in opposition

sume still more, when they speak of the occasion, which gave rise to the *Amoretti*; viz. that the poet, having lost his first Wife, fell in love a second time with a Lady, who was as cruel, as she was fair; that he tried to soften her obduracy by every topic of praise (f): But, it appears distinctly to me, who pay little regard to assumptions without authority

opposition to Mr. Ball and others. It appears from Ponsonbie, the bookseller's, dedication to Sir Robert Needham, who had brought the Manuscript from Ireland, that it was printed in *the absence* of the Author. The book is a very small volume in 12° with only one Sonnet printed on each page. This dedication is not prefixed to my Copy; but, Doctor Farmer quotes the Dedication of a Copy in the library of Emanuel College, *Emmanuel*, I should have said.

(f) Nothing can be so illogical, as assumptions against probability. That Spenser left a Son, named, *Sylvanus*, who inherited his Irish Estate, is a fact, which proves, that he had been married; and had a Son, who was born in the *Woods* of Kilcolman. Tradition tells, what probability indeed would show, that his wife was driven away from Kilcolman with him by the Irish rebellion, in 1598. It is a fact, as he himself avowed, that Spenser was abashed, when he looked forward to the *twelve* books of the *Faerie Queene*, as Pope was frightened, when he began to translate *The Iliad*: And, of consequence, Spenser was too much occupied, and too much fatigued, to write such a poem as the *Amoretti*; but, on some great occasion. It would have cost the Poet his pension, if he had addressed such love Verses to any other Nymph, than great *Cynthia* herself.

that

that the *Amoretti* were written, as an apology for the delay of the *Faerie Queene*; as memorials, that the author was still alive, and was somewhat apprehensive of being forgotten, or of being involved in the disgrace of his friend Sir Walter Raleigh. It is so extremely improbable, that Spenser, living with his Wife, and family, at Kilcolman; and writing the *Faerie Queene* in *Salvage Soyle*, far from *Parnasso Mount*, should have addressed such a body of Amatory Sonnets to a private Woman, whom to address in such encomiastic strains would have been dangerous in him and unsafe in her, that it requires the strongest proof, to establish a position of such irrational unlikelihood, as approaches, according to Mr. Locke's doctrine, even to *the confines of impossibility*.

The objects, which the Poet had obviously in view, point out the personage, to whom the poem was addressed. And every reader of discernment, who recollects Elizabeth's character; her eagerness of praise, her keenness of jealousy, the blandishments, which she allowed, and the flatteries, which she courted; must be of opinion, that each Sonnet, individually, and all the Sonnets, conjointly, prove

fatis-

satisfactorily, the *Amoretti* of Spenser to have been addressed to *the fairest proud*:

- " The *Sovereign* beauty, which I do admire,
- " Witness *The world* how worthy to be prais'd;
- " The light whereof hath kindled heavenly fire
- " In my frail spirit, *by her from baseness rais'd* (g).

After smoothing the ruggedness of Elizabeth, by his *Amoretti*, and panegerising her

(g) In his first Sonnet the Poet speaks of her *Angel's blessed look*; in S. 2. he calls her *that fairest proud*; in S. 3. he admires her as *the Sovereign beauty*; in S. 5. he talks of her *portly pride*, which he often diversifies into *high look* [S. 10.] *proud port*, [S. 12.] *awful Majesty* [Ib]; in S. 15. he describes *her looks* as *finest gold on ground*, *her mind* as adorned with *virtues manifold*; in S. 17. he despairs of being able to paint

- " The glorious *pourtraict* of that *angel's face*,
- Made to amaze weak men's confused skill.

But, he comes, at length, in S. 33, and 34 to the two great objects of his *Amoretti*:

Great wrong I do, I can it not deny
To that most sacred *Empress*, my dear dread,
Not finishing her *Queens of Faerie*
That mote [might] enlarge her living praises, dead:
But, Lodowick, this of grace to me aread;
Do you not think th' accomplishment of it,
Sufficient work for one man's simple head,
All were it, as the rest, but rudely writ.
How then should I, without an other wit,
Should ever to endure such tedious toil?
Sith that this one is tost with troublous fit
Of a *proud love*, that doth my spirit spoil:

Cease,

her beauty and her virtues, by the Faerie
 Queene, the Poet returned to Kilcolman,
 at

Cease, then, till *she* vouchsafe to grant me rest,
 Or lend you me another living brest.

Like as a ship, that through the Ocean wide,
 By conduct of some star doth make her way,
 When as a storm hath dim'd her trusty guide

Out of her course doth wander far astray!

So I, whole *star*, that went with *her bright ray*,

Me to direct, with clouds is over cast,

Do wander now in darkness and dismay,

Through hidden perils round about me past:

Yet, hope I well, that when this storm is past,

My Helice, the load star of my life,

Will shine again, and look on me at last,

With lovely light to clear my cloudy grief.

Till then I wander careful, comfortless,

In secret sorrow, and sad pensiveness.

I said above, that the two great objects of the *Amorist* were, an Apology for not proceeding with the *Faerie Queene*, and an attempt to clear himself from the cloud, under which he wandered in darkness, and dismay. The two Sonnets, which have just been quoted, are the most positive proofs of both my assertions. Add to these, S. 74. in which he mentions Elizabeth by name, and S. 80, wherein he again apologises for the detention of the *Faerie Queene*, and promises the more vigorous prosecution of the whole work.

Now; what woman, but Queen Elizabeth, who had a patent of monopoly for that poem, had any connection with the *Faerie Queene*? The answer must be, that the Sonnets had been impertinent, if applied to any other fair one: And, see S. 86, wherein he imprecates, in a strain of sublimity of Poetry, *the bitter pains of hell, on the venomous tongue*, that with

at the end of the year 1596. But, the patronage, and the power, of Elizabeth, were insufficient to avert the fate, which unhappily awaited Spenser. The clouds, which had been long collecting in the South of Ireland, burst forth into a storm, in October 1598; and, the Irish of Munster, rising universally in rebellion, laid waste the Country, and expelled the English: Neither Kilcolman, nor Spenser were spared (*b*). He was thus constrained to return with his Wife, and family, to England; but in ruined circumstances. Spenser died in London, during the year 1599 (*i*); leaving a Son, called Sylvanus, who inherited his Estate, without the poet's genius, talents, or fame; and who found it difficult, during the revolutions of Ireland, and their incidental forfeitures,

false forged lies, in his true love did stir up coals of fire: and S. 87, and 88, wherein he deploras his absence [from Court, at Kilcolman.]

- “ Since I did leave the presence of my love
- “ Many long weary days I have out worn:
- “ Since I have lack'd the comfort of that light
- “ The which was wont to lead my thoughts along
- “ I wander, as in darkness of the night,
- “ Affraid of every danger's least dismay.

(*b*) Moryson's Itinerary, p. 25. Smith's History of Cork, vol. i. p. 55, 233-6.

(*i*) In opposition to the monumental inscription in Westminster Abbey, I concur with Sir James Ware, and Mr. Malone,

forfeitures, to transmit that estate to his grand children (k).

From

Malone, in sayings, that Spenser died, in 1599, though towards the end, rather than the beginning of that year: For, the preface of *Belvidere*, or *Garden of the Muses*, which was printed, in 1600, speaks of Spenser as an *extant poet*. My searches at Doctors Commons discovered neither any Will of Spenser, nor administration to his Estate.

(k) As an additional proof how much may be collected by active perseverance, I beg to lay before the reader *The Case of William Spenser, Grandson and Heir of Edmond Spenser the Poet*, which gives a more distinct account of the Poet's descendants than has yet been done: I have sent the original to The British Museum, for the benefit of the Public:—

The Case of William Spencer of Kilcolman in the County of Cork in the Kingdom of Ireland, Esq; Grandson and Heir to Edmond Spenser the Poet:—

That Sylvanus Spencer Esq; Father of William, in his life-time, in order to prefer his second brother Peregrine in marriage; did give and assign to him part of his Estate in the said County of Cork.

Peregrine dies, and that Part of the Estate that was settled on him by Sylvanus, descended and came to Hugoline Son of the said Peregrine.

Hugoline being seized and possessed of the said Estate, was Outlaw'd for Treason and Rebellion after the late Revolution.

William Spencer finding Hugoline's Estate vested in the King, and being the next protestant Heir, as also Heir at Law to him, that part of the Estate being formerly vested in Sylvanus (to whom William was eldest Son and Heir) did apply himself to his Majesty for a grant thereof, and by

From the foregoing documents, I will assume, as a certainty, what I have proved by evidence,

his petition did set forth his claim to the said Estate, and also his services, sufferings, and losses in the late Rebellion in Ireland, in behalf of the Government, which are very well known.

Upon which petition his Majesty was graciously pleased to refer the same to the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury in England, and they were pleased to refer it further to the Earls of Monrath, Drogheda, and Galloway, then Lords Justices of Ireland, to examine the matter and make their report.

The Lords Justices reported it back to the Lords of the Treasury of England; wherein they recommend the said William to His Majesty for his great services, sufferings and losses in the late Troubles, and that he was next protestant Heir to Hugoline, and to deserve His Majesty's Grace and Favour.

His Majesty was thereupon graciously pleased to grant the said Hugoline's Estate, to the said William, by His Letters patents bearing date at Dublin the fourteenth day of June, in the ninth year of His Reign.

That the said Estate was then of the yearly value of sixty-seven pounds seventeen shillings and six pence.

That there is a mortgage upon the said Estate for five hundred pounds, which is yet unpaid.

That it cost the said William, above six hundred pounds, the best part of his fortune, in improving the said Estate, and procuring the said Grant, and hath received little or no profit thereof.

For by a late Act of Parliament, all Grants were made void in Ireland, and the forfeited Estates were vested in Trustees, to be sold for the use of the publick, and whilst that

evidence, which cannot be countervailed, that Spenser address'd his *Amoretti* to Elizabeth.

that Act was in agitation the said William was so disabled by sickness, that he could not apply himself to this Honourable House for a saving clause, whereby the Trustees have dispossessed the said William of the said Estate, without any manner of consideration for his improvements and other charges about the same, to his utter ruin and impoverishment.

That this is conceived to be the only case of this nature in the whole Kingdom of Ireland, he being the next Protestant Heir, and whose Grand-father Edmond Spencer by his Book, entitul'd, a View of Ireland, modied the settlement of that Kingdom, and these lands were given him by Queen Elizabeth of blessed memory for his Services to the Crown.

That your Petitioner having apply'd himself to this Honourable House last Sessions of Parliament for relief herein.

The Petitioner was refer'd to the Trustees then in England, who reported the same to this Honourable House, and upon further consideration of that Report the same was refer'd to the Trustees in Ireland, who now have made their Report to this effect :

That the Petitioner was very serviceable to the publick, by being a guide to His Majesty's General the Earl of Arthlone, during the late wars in that Kingdom.

That he had 300 Head of black Cattle and 1500 Sheep taken from him, had several Houses burnt : That his family was stript, his house plunder'd, and his only Son had above twenty wounds given him by the Irish Army.

That in consideration of his said services and sufferings, and of his being next Protestant Heir to Hugoline Spencer, Attainted; His Majesty was pleased to Grant the forfeited

beth. I will now proceed to show, that Shakspeare wrote his *Sonnets*; in emulation of Spenser. Like other men of uncommon genius, Shakspeare was conscious of his own powers, which, he probably perceived, were not always appreciated to the full claim of his pride. He saw Spenser placed in the foremost rank of Poets (1): He observed Spenser place

Estate of the said Hugoline to the Petitioner in 1697, now set at Sixty pounds per Ann.

That there is a claim heard and allow'd as an Incumbrance of £. 300 absolute, on the said Estate, and £. 200 more in case Hugoline who is very old and unmarried, dies without Issue male.

That the Petitioner has expended near the Sum mention'd in his Petition, in making Journeys into England to procure his Grant, in passing his patent in Ireland, and in building a House and planting an Orchard on the premises, so that his Grant has hitherto been a charge to him, and not an advantage; All which they submit to this Honourable House.

And the Petitioner humbly hopes this Honourable House will be pleased to take his Case into consideration, and re-establish him in his said Estate, or otherwise relieve him as to your great wisdom shall seem meet.

(1) Bishop Hall, in his fourth Satyre, thus breaks out:

- " But, let no rebel Satyre dare traduce
- " Th' eternal legends of thy *faerie* muse,
- " Renowned Spenser; whom no earthly wight
- " Dares once to emulate, much less dares despight.
- " Salust of France, and Tuscan Ariost,
- " Yield up the laurel Garland ye have lost:

" And

place Alabaster, and Daniel, before him (m): And he often heard poetasters of very inferior talents named, as poets, while he was passed by, in silence (n). Shakspeare knew also what all men, foreigners, as well as subjects, understood, that Elizabeth delighted in blandishments, and fawned on flatterers. And he was, thus, induced to write his Sonnets, in emulation of Spenser's Amoretti: So, he cries out in his 80th Sonnet:

" O how I faint, when I of you do write!
 " Knowing a better sprite doth use your name;
 " And, in the praise thereof, spends all his might,
 " To make me tongue ty'd, speaking of your fame (o).

He

" And let all others, willow wear with me,
 " Or let their undeserving temples bared be.

[I quote from the Edition 1602.]

(m) In Colin Clout, which though written, in 1591, was first published, in 1595:

" And there is Alabaster thoroughly taught,
 " In all this skill, though knownen yet to few;
 " Yet were he knowne to Cynthia, as he ought,
 " His Elifir would be redde anew.
 " Who lives, that can match that heroick Song,
 " Which he hathe of that mightie Princesse made?

Spenser immediately exclaims;

" Then rouse thy feathers quickly Daniel."

(n) Lodge's *Wits Miserie*, 1596, p. 57.

(o) Mr. Malone, indeed, says. " That Spenser, who was then in the Zenith of his reputation, was the person here alluded to [Sup. vol. i. p. 645.] But, Dr. Sewell, who *revised*,

He artfully endeavours, in his 83d Sonnet, to raise himself to a level with his opponent, by telling the object of his adoration :—

“ There lives more life, in one of *your fair eyes*,

“ Than *both* your poets can, in praise devise.”

Shakspeare's emulation again breaks out, in his 85th Sonnet :—

“ My tongue-ty'd muse, in manners, holds her still

“ While comments of your praise, richly compil'd, I

“ Reserve their character with golden quill,

“ And precious phrase, by all the Muses fil'd.

“ I think

and corrected, an Edition of Shakspeare's *Works*, for the Book-sellers, in 1728, preceded Mr. Malone, in this remark, and went beyond him far, in the argument, whereby he supported his position, that *Shakspeare emulated Spenser* : “ We find, “ to wander no farther, that Spenser, Cowley, and many “ others, paid their first fruits of poetry to a real, or an “ imaginary Lady. Upon this occasion, I conjecture, that “ Shakspeare took fire on reading our admirable Spenser, “ who went but just before him in the line of life, and was “ in all probability the Poet most in vogue, at that time. “ To make this argument the stronger, Spenser is taken “ notice of in one of these little pieces [The *Passionate Pilgrim*] as a favourite of our Author's. He alludes “ certainly to the *Fairy Queen*, when he mentions his “ *Deep Conceit*; that Poem being entirely allegorical. It “ has been remarked, that more Poets have sprung from “ Spenser, than all our other English Writers; to which “ let me add an observation of the late Dr. Garth, That “ most of our late ones [Poets] have been spoiled by too “ early an admiration of Milton. Be it to Spenser, then, “ that we owe Shakspeare,

“ The fairest Scyon of the fairest tree !”

[vol. x. pref. vii.]

- " I think good thoughts, whilst others write good words,
 " And, like unletter'd Clerk, still cry *Amen*
 " To every hymn, that *able sprite* affords,
 " In polish'd form of well refined pen :
 " Hearing you prais'd, I say, 'tis so, 'tis true.

In his 86th Sonnet, Shakspeare's pride of genius tries to rise above his rival :—

- " Was it the proudful Sail of *his great Verse*,
 " Bound for the prize of *all-too-precious you*,
 " That did my ripe thoughts in my brain inhearse,
 " Making their tomb, the womb wherein they grew ?
 " Was it *his spirit* by *spirits taught to write*
 " Above a mortal pitch, that struck me dead ?
 " No ; neither he, nor his Compeers, by night,
 " Giving him aid, my verse astonished.

- " But, when your countenance fil'd up his line ;
 " Then, lack'd I matter, that enfeebl'd mine.

Add to those proofs, that Shakspeare was a diligent reader of Spenser, and an avowed admirer of his *deep conceit* (p). Spenser appears

(p) In Colin Clout, 1595. Sign. C. 2. Spenser says :—

- " And, there, *though last not least*, is Action."
 " *Though last, not least* in love, your's good Trebonius."

[Shak. Jul. Cæs.]

Shakspeare avows his admiration of Spenser in the *Pastorale Pilgrim*, though Spenser had not espied the merits of Shakspeare :—

- " Spenser to me, whose *deep conceit* is such

- " As passing all conceit, needs no defence."

This, says Mr. Malone, as Dr. Sewell had said before him, " seems to allude to the *Faerie Queene*. If so, the Sonnets were not written till after 1590, when the first three books

of

pears to have been plainly in the mind of Shakspeare, during the year 1596. Now ; if it be true, as I have shown, that Spenser addressed his *Amoretti* to Elizabeth ; if it be true, as I have proved, that Shakspeare wrote his *Sonnets*, in emulation of Spenser, and in imitation of the *Amoretti* ; this important conclusion will follow, that Shakspeare also addressed his *Sonnets* to the same Queen.

Yet, is it said pretty positively by Mr. Malone, that, " Daniel's *Sonnets*, which were " published, in 1592, appear to have been " the model that Shakspeare followed (q)." Though probability be violated by this assertion, neither argument is brought to justify its unlikelihood, nor authority to support its inference ; There is between Daniel's *Sonnets*

of that poem were published. [Sup. vol. i. 714.] This is the truth ; but it is not the whole truth ! The *Faerie Queene*, which was completely printed, and re-printed, in 1596, was often alluded to in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, that was written, in its rude sketch, as I will show, in 1596 : Mistress Page says, " My Nan shall be the *Queene of all the Faeries* ;—The *Amoretti* of Spenser were certainly published, for the first time, in 1595 : The *Sonnets* of Shakspeare, as Meres asserts, were handed about, among his private friends, before September 1598 : This implies, that they had been recently written : And, I suppose, that they were written, partly, in 1596, and partly, in 1597.

(q) Sup. vol. i. p. 581. " and

and Shakspeare's no other Analogy, than the same construction, as Sonnets, and similar topicks, as amatory Verses.

But, in the *Amoretti* of Spenser, and the *Sonnets* of Shakspeare, may be seen, not only the same mode of construction, as Sonnets, the like similarity of topicks, but even a frequent sameness of expression. I will prove these positions, by the minute detail of striking comparisons : Spenser opens his *Amoretti*, by dedicating, in his first Sonnet, his *leaves*, lines, and rhimes, to his blessed ANGEL, whom he endeavours alone to gratify :

" Leaves, lines, and rimes, seek her to please alone,

" Whom, if ye please, I care for other none."

Shakspeare opens his amatory ditties, in a different manner ; and does not avow the *same unity of purpose*, till he arrives at his 103d Sonnet, wherein, speaking of his *Argument*, he cries out, at length :—

" Were it not sinful, then, striving to mend,

" To mar the subject, that before was well !

" For, to no other pass my verses tend,

" Than of your graces, and your gifts to tell."

He enlarges on *this purpose*, not of one verse, but of all his verses, shewing the *unity of their design*, in his 105th Sonnet :

" Let not my love be called idolatry ;

" Nor my beloved as an idol show ;

" Since all alike my Songs, and praises be

" To one, of one, still such, and ever so :

" Therefore,

"Therefore, my *Verse* to constancy confin'd,

"One thing expressing, leaves out difference.

Mr. Steevens quotes some of these verses (r), for the purpose of showing, what they do not show, viz. that Shakspeare intended some of his Sonnets for publication; without perceiving, that the Poet proves, by his expressions, the *Unity* of his design, and the *constancy* of his application of his praises, to one object. Mr. Malone, indeed, insists, this object was not a female; "the majority of them not being directed to a female (s)." Shakspeare, surely,

(r) Sup. vol. i. p. 704.

(s) Sup. vol. i. 653, 685. Mr. Malone says, specifically, "that one hundred and twenty of the Sonnets are addressed to a man; the remaining twenty-eight are addressed to a Lady" [Ib. 579.] The anonymous Critic before mentioned [British Critic, vol. 9. p. 515.] remarks; "Mr. Malone has observed very justly, that of the whole number of 154 Sonnets, 120 are addressed to a Man, and 28 to a Lady. Here is a manifest error in the Arithmetic, both as written by Mr. Malone, and copied by Mr. Chalmers; it should be 126 to a male, which is the fact, for the 125th Sonnet begins, *O, thou my lovely boy.*" But, why question the sufficiency of Mr. Malone's arithmetic, or my little skill in the common rules of Addition and Subtraction, to calculate, that 120 and 28 do not make up the Sum total of 154? He meant merely to give it as his opinion, that the poet had addressed 120 Sonnets to a man, and 28 to a Woman; and I took him, implicitly,

at

surely, knew his own design: And, having avowed his purpose, by repeated declarations, of praising *one*, the contrarieties of Commentators ought to vanish, as darkness disappears at the approach of day. When he, who knew best, has spoken, positively, and may well be believed; whilst they, who know not at all, although the author wrote plainly; and who nevertheless, talk, contradictorily, may well be disregarded.

Shakspeare unfolds, at once, his amatory purpose, by a proposal of marriage to his *fairest creature*:

"Thou that art now *the world's fresh Ornament*,

"And only *herald* to the *gaudy Spring* (t)."

at his word; knowing, that neither the one position, nor the other was right. He left the balance of Six, (as this number had been given neither to man, woman, nor boy) to be addressed, according to the sublime doctrine of the Commentators, to an *Hermaphrodite*. The Anonymous Critic was quite consistent, when he was detecting the blunders of Mr. Malone, and Mr. Chalmers, in Arithmetic, to fall into a blunder of statement himself: It is not the 125th, but the 126th, Sonnet, which, according to Mr. Malone's Edition, Mr. Steevens's Edition, and the original Edition, speaks of the "lovely boy."—As to the Sophistry of assuming *the fact*, which is the point to be proved, I will only, here, remark the unfairness of it.

(t) Shakspeare, when writing the above Couplet, had probably his eye on the 70th Son. of Spenser:

"*Fresh Spring, the herald of love's mighty King.*"

He

He woos her to marriage, because "from
 " fairest Creatures we desire increase," through
 several Sonnets, by every topick of Courtship.
 On the contrary, Spenser postpones his propo-
 sal of marriage till his Sixty-fifth Sonnet; urg-
 ing his "*fair love*,"

" That fondly fear to lose your liberty,
 When losing one, two liberties you gain:
 Without constraint, or dread of any ill,
 The gentle bird feels no captivity,
 Within her Cage, but *sings*, and feeds her fill.
 There pride dare not approach, nor discord spill
 The league 'twixt them that loyal love hath bound.

Shakspeare, in his 8th Sonnet, rings all the
 changes on the topick of music, having in his
 eye, no doubt, the Sonnet of Spenser, which
 has just been quoted.

" If the true *Concord* of well-tuned sounds,
 " By *Unions married*, do offend thine ear,
 " They do but sweetly chide thee, who confounds
 " In singleness the parts, that thou shouldst bear.
 " Mark how *one string*, sweet husband to an other,
 " Strikes each in each, by mutual ordering;
 " Resembling Sire, and Child, and happy Mother,
 " Who all in *one*, one pleasing *note* do *sing*.

Spenser urges his sweetheart to take *joyous*
time by the forelock:

" Make haste, therefore, *sweet love*, whilst it is prime;
 " For, none can call again the passed time.

Shakspeare, in his 2d, 3d, 5th, and 6th
 Sonnets, presses on his "*beauteous niggard*"

the same topick, from the effluxion of years:

" For, never resting time leads Summer on

" To hideous Winter, and confounds him there.

And, in several of the Sonnets, wherein the dear delight of both is wooed to wed, by all the blandishments of poetry, Shakspeare, not only catches the topicks of Spenser, but even copies his words (u). Spenser attributes her creation to the hand of nature, and her

(u) Compare Spenser's 3d Son. with Shakspeare's 5th and 69th. Spenser's 4th Son. with Shakspeare's 3d and 21st. Spenser speaks, in his 5th Son. of her *portly pride*, of *HER lofty looks*; "threatning rash eyes, that gaze on her so wide: Shakspeare in his 5th Son. talks of "The lovely gaze where every eye doth dwell." Spenser in Son. 10, exclaims:

" Unrighteous Lord of Love, what law is this

" That me thou makest thus tormented be?

" See how, the Tyranness doth joy to see

" The huge massacres, which her eyes do make."

Shakspeare in his 26th Son. cries out:—

" Lord of my Love, to whom in Vassalage,

" Thy merit hath my duty strongly knit,

" To thee, I send this written Embassage

" To witness duty, not to show my wit."

In his 131st Son. he says "Thou art as tyrannous." In his 131st Son. he asks, in the Spirit of Spenser, "O! from what power hast thou this powerful might?" Spenser in his 11th Son. also sends an "Embassage to sue for peace; and to offer hostages, for his truth." In Son. 41, and 48, Spenser complains of her Cruelty; Shakspeare also complains of her cruelty, in his 131st and 133d Sonnets.

birth

birth to a divine origin (x): Shakspeare also gives her the same origin, and the same birth (y). Spenser likens his Goddess to what is most brilliant on earth, saphyrs, rubies, pearls, ivory, gold, and silver sheen (z):

"But, that which fairest is, and few behold,

"Her mind adorned is with virtues manifold:"

Shakspeare, trying to outdo his rival, compares, obliquely, *his fair* "to those gold candles fixed in heaven's air;" and adds "that she is as fair, in knowledge, as in hue (a)."

Spenser praises his *divine object*, by drawing topicks, from the *Seasons*, from a *Storm*, from the *Sky* (b): In the same strain, Shakspeare derives topicks of commendation from the *Seasons*, from a *Storm*, from the *Stars* (c). Spenser likens the *idol of his thought* to a rich laden *bark*, with precious *merchandize* (d): Shakspeare also sends out his "*saucy bark*," laden with her *worth, wide, as the ocean is*; and at last exclaims,

"That love is *merchandiz'd*, whose rich esteeming

"The Owner's tongue doth publish every where."

Spenser has a *Dream of pompous royalty*, and of a feast, fit to entertain the greatest *Prince* (e):

(x) Son. 17. (y) Son. 20. (z) Son. 15. (a) Son. 21. 85. (b) Son. 62. 63. 72. (c) Son. 32, 33, 34, 14. (d) Compare Spen. Son. 81, with Shak. Son. 80, 102. (e) Son. 77.

Shakspeare

Shakspeare also flatters himself with a *dream*, wherein he fancies himself, "in sleep, a king (*f*)."
Spenser goes into *The Theatre*, for diversities of celebration (*g*):
Shakspeare finds on the *Stage* dumb pre-fagers of his speaking breast; and cries out, with a theatrical tone,

"O! learn to read what *silent* love hath writ;

"To *hear* with *eyes* belongs to love's fine wit (*h*)."

Shakspeare likewise copied Spenser, in supposing, that the fair object of his praise would be immortalized, by his Sonnets: Spenser desires his *fair proud* to cherish his *verses*, that *never shall expire*, that shall make *her immortal* (*i*): Shakspeare is equally confident, as a prophet, that her most high deserts would live, for ever, in his rhyme;—

"But, thy eternal Summer shall not fade;

"Nor, shall death brag thou wandrest in his shade;

"So long as men can breath, or eyes can see;

"So long *lives this*, and this gives life to thee (*k*)."

Shakspeare, after so many imitations, when he comes to his close, copies Spenser's

(*f*) Son. 87. (*g*) Son. 54. (*h*) Son. 23. (*i*) Son. 27,
69, 75. (*k*) Son. 18, 19, 55.

E

concluding

concluding stanzas, about Cupid, and Dian; and Dian's maid, who stole his shafts: The tautology, the thoughts, the words, in both the poets, are the same (1). Yet, Shakspeare having some intimation of Spenser's embarrassments, which, indeed, are plainly avowed in his *Amoretti*, seems to sneer at the pension of his rival: For, he says, "I will not praise, that *purpose not to sell; who plead for love, and look for recompence* (m)." And, he appears to affect a superior independence; as if he had been anticipating Pope's petulance, when he desires his love to accept his *oblation*, *poor but free* (n). Spenser, however, had given him a specimen of this kind of Cant, for imitation:

"*Fondness* it were, for any, being *free*,

"To covet fetters, though they golden be (o)."

Such are the proofs, which, as I before proposed, I have now adduced, in support of my positions, that Spenser addressed his

(1) Compare Spenser's concluding verses, with Shakspeare's two last Sonnets, 153, and 154.

(m) Son. 21, 23. (n) Son. 125, 25.

(o) Son. 37. *Fondness*, in the language of that age, meant *foolishness*.

Amoretti, wholly, to Elizabeth; that Shakspeare, in imitation of Spenser, addressed his Sonnets, entirely, to the same Queen: But, there are those, who prefer prejudices to proofs; who reason from doubtful assumptions, rather than from logical deductions; and who start difficulties, when they ought to relinquish prepossession.

I will now proceed to answer such objections to my results, as have occurred to my observation.

It has never been shown, with any precision, to whom either Spenser addressed his *Amoretti*, or Shakspeare his *Sonnets*: There are not, therefore, any persons in possession of those Amatory Verses, who must be dispossessed of their rights, if the title be adjudged to Elizabeth. To suppose, that Spenser, and Shakspeare, in their situations, as married men, and in their circumstances, as to wealth, addressed such Sonnets to ordinary Women, (and much more to ordinary Men,) we must at once presume, in opposition to *the fact*, that those illustrious poets were destitute of common sense, and

were without any employment for their transcendent talents.

It has been conjectured, indeed, that the Sonnets of Shakspeare, at least one hundred and twenty of them, were addressed to two men, or boys; to W. Hart, or to W. Hughes. Thorpe, the first publisher of them, dedicated those *Amatory* effusions "to the *only* "*begetter* of these ensuing Sonnets, Mr. "W. H."—How he was the *begetter* of them, it is not easy to tell; unless we presume, what is not improbable, that he begot a desire in Shakspeare to deliver a Copy to the Bookseller, for publication: W. H. was the *getter* of the manuscript, imperfect as it was, from which the Sonnets were printed inaccurately. Doctor Farmer was thus iduuced, though with little felicity of conjecture, to suppose that many of these Sonnets were addressed to the poet's Nephew, William Harte, the Son of his Sister, Joan: That critic's conjecture, then, is, that an Uncle addressed one hundred and twenty *Amatory* Sonnets to his Nephew: But, Mr. Malone confutes Doctor

Doctor Farmer's conjecture, by shewing, that Joan Harte's children were all young, in 1616, even twenty years after the writing of the verses; "Many of them," adds Mr. Malone, "are written to shew the propriety of Marriage; and therefore, cannot well be supposed to be addressed to a *Schoolboy* (p)." Yet Mr. Tyrwhit pointed out a line:—

"A man in *hew* all Hews in his controlling,"

which

(p) The before mentioned Anonymous Critic [The British Critic, vol. ix. p. 516] says "when Mr. C. adds, p. 50, to *shew the propriety of Marriage*, we do not find that he is warranted by Mr. M. whom he *seems* to quote. They were certainly written to shew *him* that propriety." I see enough of the British Critic's meaning to understand, that he designed to maintain, that Mr. Malone's observation was applied to a *man*, and not to a *schoolboy*, who had not yet arrived at the age of puberty. If this were the meaning of Mr. Malone, he must have equally meant to apply to *his man*, the feminine *Epithet*, "*tender churl*," in the first Sonnet, and the womanish epithets, "*unthrifty loveliness*, and *beauteous niggard*," in the fourth sonnet. If Mr. Malone thought over the sonnets, which he was to criticise, he must, moreover, have maintained, when he made Shakspeare persuade a man to marry,

which inclined Mr. Malone to think, "that the initials W. H. stand for W. Hughes." Our commentator regards this conjecture, as not "improbable, considering, that one

which is not a very hard task, on most occasions, that the Poet said to this man, in the opening Sonnet, "from fairest creatures, we desire increase," that thereby we may have progeny: "But, *thou* [the man addressed] contracted to *thine own bright eyes*," refused to wed; thou [the man addressed] that art *now* the "*world's fresh ornament, and only herald to the gaudy spring*," art content to remain single, without pitying the world, which has a claim upon thee for Children. Now, I would ask, was there a *man* in England, who had such *bright eyes*, or could be called *the world's fresh ornament*; was there a woman in England, whom it was fit to call, as in the 5th Sonnet, "the lovely gaze, where *every eye doth dwell*?" Yes; the fitness, and the fact, properly applied to the *greatest* woman. Shakspeare goes on, in the 9th Sonnet, by a *natural collocation*, to woo *his* supposed *man* to wed; and asks, "Is it for fear to wet a *widow's* eye, that thou consum'st thyself in "single life?—When every *PRIVATE* widow well may "keep, by Children's eyes, her husband's shape in "mind."—I never supposed, that Mr. Malone was so absurd as to apply such persuasions to a *man*. It is only the Anonymous *Critic*, who is so absurd, as to apply such sentiments, and expressions, to a *man*, or indeed to any *woman*, except Elizabeth.

of

“ of the Sonnets is formed entirely on a
 “ play on our author’s Christian name. (q)”

When Shaspeare talked of his love,
 “ as the *master-mistress* of his passion,”
 Mr. Steevens exclaimed, “ how impossible
 “ it is, to read this fulsome panegyric, ad-
 “ dressed to a male object, without an
 “ equal mixture of disgust and indigna-
 “ tion (r).” Such are the avowed opinions
 of those famous Critics, and celebrated
 Commentators!

But, there is a rule in reasoning, which,
 amid their supposes, conjectures, and in-
 dignations, they seem to have entirely for-
 gotten, that in proportion as any assertion
 is improbable, ought to be the strength of
 proof, which is necessary for its support.
 Their assumption is, that Shakspeare, a
 husband, a father, a moral man, addressed
 a hundred and twenty, nay, a hundred and
 twenty-six *Amourous* Sonnets to a male
 object! And, their proofs consist of sup-
 poses, without support, conjectures, with-

(q) Sup. vol. i. 579. (r) Ib. 596.

out conceptions, and of indignation, without propriety.

The supposition of Doctor Farmer, of whom, on any other occasion, I would speak with praise, may be safely ranked in the numerous class of *bare supposes*. Mr. Tyrwhit, whose learning, and modesty, make him respectable, even when he is mistaken, might have known, that there was not, among the poets of that age, a more common epithet for *mien*, than *hew*. Sydney, in his *Arcadia*, speaks of Mopsa's cheeks of opal *bue*: "What marvel, then, "I take a woman's *bue* (s)." Daniel, in his description of Beauty, declares:

"That sorrow is the *hewe* of sweet delight."

In his *Queen's Arcadia*, he talks of "a form, and flattered *hew*;" and he at last cries out;—

"Then, lovely Venus, in bright majesty,

"Appears with mild aspect, in dove-like hue (t)."

(s) *Arcadia*, p. 11, 43.

(t) We may thus observe, in Daniel, this unlucky word, under these forms; *hewe*, *hew*, and *heu*: again, Daniel has "That rosie *Hew*, the glory of the Cheek." [*Queen's Arcadia*.]

But,

But, it was from Spenser, that Shakspeare borrowed both the word, and the verse (*u*): When Shakspeare wrote his *twentieth Sonnet*, which Mr. Steevens, particularly, supposes to have been addressed to a *male object*, he had before his imitative eyes the *seventeenth Sonnet* of Spenser (*x*), whence our poet borrowed

(*u*) Spenser, speaking of the *mien* of Elizabeth, has lovely *hew*, [7th and 31st Son.] Glorious *hew*, [79th Son.] celestial *hew*, [3d and 45th Son.] and heavenly *hew*, [80th Son.] Add to all those examples, from Whitney's Emblems, 1586, p. 177. 227.

"The Phœnix rare, with fethers fresh of *hewe*,

"Arabia's righte, and sacred to the Sonne:

"Whome, other birdes with wonder seeme to *viewe*;

"Dothe live untill a thousand years be *ronne*:

"The one is white, the other, black, of *hewe*."

(*x*) Here is Spenser's 17th Sonnet:

"The glorious *pourtrait* of that *Angel's face*,

"Made to amaze weak *men's confused* skill;

"And this world's worthless glory to embrace,

"What pen, what *pencill*, can expresse her fill?

"For though he colours could devise at will

"And eke his learned hand at pleasure guide,

"Least trembling, it his workmanship may spill,

"Yet, many wondrous things there are beside;

"The sweet eye-glances that like arrows glide;

"The charming smiles, that rob sense from the hart,

"The lovely pleasure, and the *lofty pride*;

"Cannot expressed be by any art.

"A greater

borrowed several of the thoughts, and some of the expressions; and if Spenser drew his *pourtrait* for Elizabeth, so Shakspeare, *with nature's own hand, painted the master-mistress of his passion*, by figuring the same Queen.

The following is Shakspeare's twentieth Sonnet, which, I maintain, was addressed to a woman; and that woman, Elizabeth:

- " A woman's face, with nature's own hand painted,
- " Hast thou, the master-mistress of my passion;
- " A woman's gentle heart, but not acquainted
- " With shifting change, as is false women's fashion;
- " An eye, more bright than theirs, less false in rolling,
- " Gilding the object, whereupon it gazeth;
- " A man in hue, all hues in his [the hues] controuling,
- " Which [hue] steals mens eyes, and womens souls amazeth.
- " And, for a woman wert thou first created,
- " Till nature, as she wrought thee, fell a-doting,
- " And, by addition, me of thee defeated,
- " By adding one thing, to my purpose, nothing:

-
- " A greater Craftsman's hand thereto doth need
 - " That can express the life of things indeed."

Compare this Sonnet, with his *fourth Æglogue*, April, which the poem tells, was intended to praise Elizabeth;

- " Tell me, have ye seen her *Ango-like face*,
- " Like Phoebe fair?
- " Her heavenly 'haviour, her princely grace,
- " Can you well compare?"

" But,

"But, since she [nature] prickt thee out for women's
"pleasure;

"Mine, be thy love, and thy love's use their trea-
"sure (y)."

(y) The *master mistress*, which has given such offence, and raised such prejudices, only means, *Chiefest*: Minshew says, *Maister*, in one sense, signifies *Chief*. So, Johnson says it signifies *Chief*, head; as Master-gunner from Shakspeare, Master-piece, masterful: In the *Mencæchmi*, 1595, it is said, "Young Women are so *masterful* [Capel's Notes, 3 v. p. 466.] *Hew*, as I have already shown, was the appropriate word for *mien*, in that age; A man in *hue*, or *mien*, is the same thought, as Spenser's just description of Elizabeth's *Air*, her *lofty pride*: She was a man, in *hue*: In the *Princely Pleasures of Kenelworth Castle*, it is said;

"But tydings of our English Queene,

"Whom heaven hath deck'd with bewes."

The Creation of woman is thus described in Silvester's *Dubartas*:

"Source of all joys! Sweet he-she-coupled-one!

"Thy *sacred* birth, I never think upon,

"But, ravis'd, I admire how God did, then,

"Make *two* of *one*, and *one* of *two* again."

The thought of the *doting* of Nature, Shakspeare borrowed from Sydney's *Arcadia*, 439:

"O nature! *doting* old; O blind, dead Nature!"

To *prick* is often used by Shakspeare for to *mark*, as indeed the word is used sometimes at present: The King, every year, *pricks* the List of Sheriffs, with a golden

To Shakspeare ought surely to be allowed the same privilege, which other writers claim,

golden bodkin. But, since nature marked thee out for the *pleasure*, which belongs to woman; let mine be *thy love*, "That *love*, which *virtue* begs, and *virtue* grants;" and thy *love's use* the *treasure* of other women; now *chastity* is the appropriate treasure of women.—It will, after all, be asked, what *additional* circumstance was it, which nature, in her *doting*, superadded, and which defeated the poet from possessing his *master-mistress*. I will not shrink from the question, whatever may be its difficulty. In the mythology of Spenser, and Shakspeare, Elizabeth was sprung of *heavenly race*:

"Of fair Eliza, be your silver song

"That blessed wight;

"The flower of virgins, may she flourish long,

"In princely plight:

"For she is Syrix daughter, without pot;

"Which Pan, the Shepherds God, of her begot:

"So sprung her Grace

"Of heavenly race,

"No mortal blemish may her blot."

Now; the *no mortal blemish* of Spenser, and the *one thing* of Shakspeare, when properly compared with the Context, convey the same meaning; and lead the intelligent inquirer to infer, that it was the divine origin, or high birth, of his *master mistress*, which was the additional circumstance, that dashed all his hopes: For, she was only a man in *hue*; and she was more than
a woman,

claim, and all critics exercise, of clearing obscurities by the context. He has constantly his great rival in his head, and hand. And copying the verses, and the words of Spenser, in his twentieth Sonnet, Shakspeare evinces, by it, and by his twenty-first Sonnet, that he had Spenser for his rival, and the same personage, as Spenser, for the great object of his elaborate commendation :

“ So, it is not with me, as with *that muse* (z),

“ Stirred by a painted beauty to *his* verse ;

a woman, by *addition*. Add to the before mentioned intimations what Spenser says of Elizabeth in his 61st Sonnet :

“ The Glorious image of the maker’s beauty,

“ My *Sovereign Saint*, the idol of my thought,

“ Dare not henceforth above the bounds of duty

“ T’accuse of pride, or rashly blame for ought.

“ For, being as she is, *divinely wrought*,

“ And of the *brood of Angels heavenly born* ;

“ And with the crew of blessed Saints upbrought,

“ Each of which did her with their gifts adorn. ”

(z) Compare this with Shakspeare’s 80th Sonnet, wherein he points more distinctly at Spenser, and with his 83d, 84th, 85th, 86th, Son. wherein Shakspeare speaks plainly of two encomiasts, himself, and Spenser :

“ There lives, more life in one of your *fair eyes*

“ Than *both* your poets can in praise devise.”

“ Who

"Who Heaven itself for ornament doth use,

"And every fair with his fair doth rehearse:

"O! let me, true in love, but truly write.

"And, then, believe me, *my love is as fair*

"As any Mother's Child, though not so bright,

"As those gold candles, fixed in Heaven's air."

Shakspeare, then, having positively declared his purpose, and avowed his object, forbids Commentators, from giving him another purpose, and from assigning him a different object. The poet declared his purpose to be the praise of one; yet, the Commentators assert his purpose to have been the praise of *two*, a *male love*, and a *female*: The poet avowed the object of his many commendations to have been a *woman*; yet, the commentators insist, that the same object was a *man*: The poet speaks of *another poet*, who now appears to be Spenser; whom Shakspeare imitates, both in sentiment, and in style, and emulates in his object, and ambition: Yet, the commentators assert, that Shakspeare addressed the *most of his Sonnets* to a *man*, or to a *boy*, though Spenser demonstratively addressed his *Amoretti* to a *Queen*, to Elizabeth.

Yet,

Yet, the anonymous Critic, before mentioned, declares the twentieth Sonnet to be too *indecent* to be quoted: “ Its very *indelicacy* would have made it utterly shameful to present it to Queen Elizabeth (a).” It is for impure minds only, to be continually finding something obscene in objects, that convey nothing obscene, or offensive, to the chastest hearts. Discovering nothing indecent in that Sonnet, and feeling no disgust, at any fair construction of it, I have re-published it above; and explained its apparent meaning. If what the prudish Critics of the present day call obscenity, would have poisoned Elizabeth, she could not have lived out a twelvemonth of four and forty years (b). The anonymous Critic seems

(a) British Critic, vol. ix. 517.

(b) The Anonymous Critic never read, at least never regarded, Puttenham’s *Arte of English Poesie*, which the Author says was expressly written for the recreation of the Queen. Spenser, in his 64th Sonnet, tells Elizabeth,

“ Her goodly *bosom*, like a strawberry bed,

“ Her *neck*, like to a bunch of columbines,

“ Her *breast*, like lillies, ere their leaves be shed,

“ Her *nipples* like young blossom’d jessamines.”

In

seems ambitious of emulating those absurd historians, who constantly apply the ways of thinking of their own times, to the principles, and practices, of the past.

Such are the leading truths, which I have thus established, by a thousand proofs, in opposition to supposes, conjectures, and assumptions. Now, those truths forbid prejudice, and criticism, to substitute suggestions for facts, and fictions, for realities. It seems at length apparent, that the Commentators have had little knowledge of the connection between Spenser and Shakspeare (c), and still less information, with

In his 76th Sonnet he speaks of her

" Fair bosom, fraught with virtue's richest treasure,

" The *nest of love*, the lodging of delight,

" And 'twixt her *paps*, like early fruit in May,

" Whose harvest seem'd to hasten now apace,

" They [his frail thoughts] loosely did their wanton wings display:

" And, there, to rest themselves did boldly place."

(c) Mr. Malone, indeed, did imagine, as I have already intimated, that Shakspeare may have alluded in his 80th Sonnet to Spenser; as Sewell had said before him; but he was, at the same time, of opinion that Daniel's Sonnets had been the model, that Shakspeare followed. [Suppl. vol. i. 581, 645.]

regard

regard to the ambitious motives, or the amatory objects, either of Shakspeare, or of Spenser. And, wanting the loadstone of Elizabeth to direct their devious steps, they were easily misled by the obscurity of the Sentiment; and as constantly deluded, by the defects of the language, which they knew to be less accurate than their own; particularly, in respect to the *relatives*, and *antecedents*.

In the poetical age of Spenser, and Shakspeare, many words, in our speech, bore very different meanings, from what they do at present; our language being then much less precise, though more figurative, and energetic. The familiar word, *Lover*, was, in those times, deemed both masculine, and feminine; Minsheu, the Lexicographer, speaks of a *she-lover*, a *she-friend* (*d*): And Ben

(*d*) So, the word *love* was often substituted for *lover*: [Mal. Shak. vol. ii. 114; vol. iii. 192.]

"In our Author's time," say Mr. Malone, and Mr. Steevens, "this term [lover] was applied to those of the same sex who had an Esteem for each other. Ben Johnson concludes one of his letters to Dr.

F

Donne,

Ben Johnson subscribed himself the *lover* of Camden. The *relatives*, which are the ligatures of language; and which, when properly managed, give energy to the thought, and clearness to the expression, were in those times, adopted, without choice, and applied, without discrimination (e): *His*, and *her*, and *him*, were frequently confounded: and the personal pronoun, *his*, was often used in a neutral sense; and in the same manner, *him*, in those days, often referred to it; and *himself* was used

“ Donne, by telling him, he is his true *lover*; So, in
 “ Coriolanus: I tell thee, fellow, thy General is my
 “ *lover*. Many more instances might be added. See
 “ our Author's Sonnets *passim*.” [Steev. Shak. vol. v.
 486; vol. xii. 207.] In this strain, Juniper is made by
 Ben Johnson, in his *Case is altered*, to tell Anthony:
 “ Sirrah, there's one of my *fellows* mightily *enamoured*
 “ of thee.” And in the same Comedy, Aurelia is
 made to exclaim: “ O blind excuse! blinder than love
 “ himself.”

(e) The *French*, in *his* whole language, hath not one word, that hath *his* accent in the last syllable, save only *two*, called *Antepenult*. [Sydney's Defence of Poetry; Mulcaster's Elementarie, 1582, 76, 7; Sternhold and Hopkins's Psalms, Wolf's Edit. 1590, p. 137. and the Translation of the Bible, every where.]

for

for *itself*; which was commonly substituted for *who*, by Shakspeare (f): *This, their, they*, as they were often misused, by our poet (g), darken the brilliancy of his

(f) Steev. Shak. vol. v. 348; Mulcaster's Elementarie 82; Wits Common Wealth, 1598, p. 610.

(g) Malone's Sup. vol. i. 643, in his note on the 77th Sonnet: and see the Elementarie of Mulcaster, who had been the master of Merchant-Taylor's school from its first establishment in 1561; and who *entreated chiefly of the right writing of the English tung*, which shall appear, when the *thing itself* shall come forth in his own naturall *hew* [p. 76.] In the same page, he tells "that our *Custom* hath already beaten out his own rules." In p. 77, he says, that "our English tung hath matter enough in *hir* own, which maie direct *hir* own right." In the same page, he talks "of *euery word* almost either wanting letters for *his* necessary sound." Mulcaster, who had taught, in that celebrated seminary, upwards of twenty years, and was a learned scholar, and able writer, declared, that in 1582, "our English tung had come to the *verie height thereof*;" although he foresaw, "that the coming Generation would change their language as they had a right to do, the people having a *prerogative* to use both *speche*, and *pen*, at will." This learned grammarian wrote people *hath* [have]; *libertie* and *prerogative* is [are] the cause. [Page 160.] Let us, then, look, with an eye of Candour on the grammatical inaccuracies of Shakspeare!

language, and enfeeble the strength of his sense. The key, which I have thus put into every hand, will be found sufficient to open the darkest passages of Shakspeare's Sonnets, if the enquirer will, constantly, bear in mind, that he has *Cynthia* for his guide.

Let me establish this position, by a few examples; as the subject is curious in itself, and goes directly, to the heart of the principal question. In the very opening Sonnet, we are at once *perplexed in doubt*, by the application of the relative *his*, in a neutral sense, to a *rose*:

"From fairest Creatures we desire increase,
That, thereby, *beauty's rose*, might never die;
But, as the *riper* should, by time, de cease,
His tender heir might bear *his* memory."

In the same manner, Shakspeare again applies *his* to a *flower*, in his 94th Sonnet:

"But, if that *flower* with base infection meet,
The basest weed out-braves *his* dignity."

Our grammarians have not, I think, observed, that the pronoun *his* was, in those days, not only used in a *neutral* sense, but in a *feminine* sense; as by Spenser, in his *Æglogue* of April:

And

"And, now ye dainty Damsels may depart

"Each one *his* way (*h*)."

Shakspeare, in his 9th Sonnet, uses *himself* for *itself*, by applying *himself* to *bosom*: And so, in his 19th Sonnet, he makes *him* refer to *fair brow*; and thereby would induce a superficial reader to suppose, that the poet's *love* had been a *Male* (*i*). In the same manner, *he* and *his*, *him*, and *she*, are grievously intermixed by Shakspeare, in some others of his Sonnets (*k*). And, yet,

(*h*) Mr. Malone, indeed, has observed, that *his*, and *her*, are frequently confounded; [Shak. vol. iv. 140]; as he has equally shown, that *this*, *their*, *thy*, are often confounded [Suppl. vol. i. p. 643]. *His* and *he*, are confounded in Shakspeare's 63d Son. wherein we may see *his* often applied to *time*, and *he* to *knife*: I suspect, that *his*, in the last line but one of this Sonnet, must be understood in a feminine sense, like Spenser's *his*, when applied to a *Damsel*.

(*i*) See the 15th, 21st, 91st, Son.

(*k*) See the 66th, 67th, and 68th Son. The Poet, I believe, by introducing himself into those Sonnets, has created sad confusion with *his*, and *her*; with *he*, and *she*; and by exhausting time, and space, for conceits, he has caused a darkness more dim, than his own EREBUS.

after plunging through a world of confusion, and conceits, he constantly returns to *one, only, she*, whom he shews by his context, to be *Cynthia*, the single Goddess of his worship. Thus, after talking, darkly, in several consecutive Sonnets, he described Elizabeth so plainly, as to admit of no doubt, with regard to the object of his praise :

“ Those parts of thee, that *the world's eye doth view*,
 “ Want nothing, that the thought of hearts can mend ;
 “ *All tongues* (the voice of Souls) give *thee* that due ;
 “ Uttering bare truth, even so, as foes commend.
 “ Thy outward, thus with outward praise is crown'd ;
 “ But, those same tongues, that give thee so thine own,
 “ In other accents, do this praise confound,
 “ By seeing farther, than the eye hath shown.
 “ They look into *the beauty of thy mind*,
 “ And, that, in guess, they measure by *thy deeds* (1).”

(1) The 69th Son. and the three preceding ones : and, compare what is said above with Spenser's 3d Sonnet, wherein he speaks of the *universal* praise, which *the world* bestowed on his *Sovereign beauty* ; and his 15th Sonnet, wherein he says of Elizabeth :

“ But, that which fairest is, but few behold,
 “ Her *mind adorn'd* with *virtues manifold*.”

It is, then, apparent, that Shakspeare had his eye on Spenser's 15th Sonnet, when he wrote the above ; and that both the poets had the same great object in their contemplation.

It

It has, however, been observed to me, that the 3d Sonnet of Shakspeare must have been addressed to a man, otherwise why ask the questions :

“ For where is she so fair, whose unear’d womb

“ Disdain the tillage of *thy husbandry* ?

“ Or, who is he, so fond, will be the tomb

“ Of his self-love, to stop posterity ?”

The context is, certainly, the best expostor : Now, the first four lines of this Sonnet, and the six last, are plainly addressed to the same woman, whom the poet had wooed to wed in his first Sonnet, and his second : If the *husbandry* of Elizabeth were *celibacy*, then every woman would disdain *her husbandry* (m) ; because she is urged by the

(m) *Husbandry* is generally used by Shakspeare, says Mr. Malone, for *Economical prudence* ; [Sup. vol. i. 591 ;] and it is so used in the 15th Sonnet : But, in the 3d Sonnet, it is used in a more appropriate, though not a very different, sense : In his first Sonnet, he calls his *fair one* “ tender *churl* ;” in his fourth, “ beauteous “ *niggard* ;” and “ profitless *usurer*.” And this *third* Sonnet is, particularly, quoted by the said Anonymous Critic, for proving, that it was addressed to a man : But, he forbears to comment, having his mind still filled with the horrors of obscenity. In this strain,

the law of nature to wed, if she can match herself fitly : Nor, is any man so foolish as

he goes on to say that, in the same Sonnet we find the person's mother was alive :

"Thou art thy mother's glass, and she, in thee,

"*Calls back* the lovely April of her prime:"

Now; this expression, *Calls back*, which proves, according to the Critic, that the person's Mother was *alive*, conveys clearly to my mind, that *she was dead*; as the term implies, and the context proves; But, he asks, what are we to say of this line?

"You had a father; let your son say so."

Why; I say, historically, that Elizabeth had a father; and that she was courted by all the world, from the Speaker of the House of Commons to Spenser, and Shakspeare; in order, that she might have a Son. I say, moreover, that it was very uncritical, and unfair, to quote a *single line*; disregarding the *object*, and the *context*, of the Poet. By pursuing this mode of Criticism, and by hanging forced meanings on detached passages, the same Critic might very easily fix *blasphemy* on the *Scriptures*: So, did Counsellor Erskine insist on behalf of Stockdale, when prosecuted by order of the House of Commons, for a libel; and in this spirit did Lord Kenyon direct the Jury to read the *whole book*, for finding the writer's *object*, and to compare the *Context*, in order to discover his real meaning. If the anonymous Critic had gone on to the fourth Sonnet, he would have seen expressions, which cannot be properly applied to a man: "Unthrifty loveliness; beauteous niggard:" If you wed not, the Poet adds:

"Thy unus'd beauty must be tomb'd with Thee."

to

to bury his self-love, by stopping his posterity, if he can avoid his bane; because the same law of nature equally influences him. Over the *illation* of Shakspeare, there certainly hangs a thick cloud: Yet, I think, I can, with *spectacles on nose*, see into this *darkness visible*, and discover some glimmerings of sense. The poet, probably, meant to argue, that as every fair one disclaims such unfruitful husbandry as your's, why do not you also disdain what is so contrary to the nature both of women, and of men: If your mother had adopted your husbandry, you had never been; if you continue the same husbandry, where will you be hereafter?

“Die single, and thy image dies with thee.”

Such is the construction, which the poet's context requires: and every fair construction ought to be made, rather than consider Shakspeare as a miscreant, who could address amatory Verses to a man, “with a romantic *platonism of affection* (n).” But, I have

(n) So says the writer, in the *British Critic*, vol. ix. p. 517. In order to justify this imputation of *Platonism*,

the

have freed him, I trust, from this stain, in opposition to his commentators, by shewing, distinctly, his real object. This object, being once known, darkness brightens into light, order springs out of confusion, and contradiction settles into sense.

This acknowledged object is the pole-star, which conducts the inquisitive reader through mazy darkness into open day: It plays its coruscations on the 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th, 5th, 6th, the 7th, the 8th Sonnets; and still more vividly on the 9th Sonnet:

the anonymous Critic, who is very *german* to one of the *great Commentators* on Shakspeare, says, that "it was a fault of *Youth*; and of a time when very romantic addresses to friends were not uncommon." [Id.] Shakspeare's Sonnets were certainly written, as I have proved, in 1596, or 1597, when he was two, or three and thirty, after he had been married fourteen years, and had a daughter Susanna, who, as she was baptized, on the 26th of May 1583, was then advanced to the age of puberty. It is, therefore, untrue, that Shakspeare was a *youth*, in 1596; and it is altogether improbable, considering his situation, and mode of life, that he would have written such *romantic addresses*, without having some great object in view, and upon some extraordinary occasion.

"Is

" Is it for fear to wet a widow's eye,
 " That thou consum'st thyself in single life?
 " Ah! if thou issueless shalt hap to die,
 " The world will wail *thee*, like a *makeless* wife (o)."

" When every *private* widow well may keep,
 " By children's eyes, her husband's shape in mind."

This Star, again, shines out more brightly, in the 10th Sonnet, wherein he tells the

(o) Mr. Malone very well explains the *makeless* wife to mean " as a widow bewails her husband ;" *make*, and *mate*, being formerly synonymous. [Suppl. vol. i. 588.] In the two concluding lines, there is some doubt thrown on this Sonnet, which is very distinctly addressed to a *Woman*, by applying, according to the unprecise idiom of that age, the pronoun *himself* to *besom* : For Dr. Johnson, from the Authority of Shakspeare himself, says it was in ancient Authors used *neutrally*, for itself; as :

" ———— *She* is advanc'd
 " Above the Clouds, as high as heaven *himself*."

I do not recollect, in the writings of Shakspeare, the word *Widower*, which would have been the appropriate expression, if the 9th Sonnet had been addressed to a Man : Yet, the word had been long in use, in its well known sense, before Shakspeare came into public life. In Mulcaster's *Elementarie*, 1582, p. 225, we may see, *Widoer* and *Widow* : Sir John Harrington wrote in 1599, " that my Lord Keeper is a *Widower*." [*Nugæ Antiquæ*, vol. ii. p. 27.]

object

object addressed, "*thou art beloved of many,*
 " *be as thy presence is, gracious, and kind.*"
 The context shows the real object through
 the thin disguise, in the 11th, 12th, 13th
 Sonnets, in the last of which, we may see
 the unfair quotation of the writer, in the
British Critic :

" ——— *Dear, my love, you know,*

" *You had a father ; let your Son say so (p).*"

The same light shines, with sufficient
 brilliance, for the dimmest sight, to see, that
 the 14th Sonnet was addressed to a woman,
 and to Elizabeth ; from whose *eyes* the poet
 derives his knowledge ; because they are
constant stars, which show him truth, and
beauty. The context forbids any applica-
 tion to a *male object*, in the 15th Sonnet,
 which does not give the least intimation of
 a man ; or in the 16th, which is quoted as
 one of the proofs of our poet's *platonism* :
 After courting his object to marry, by
 urging *it*, to fortify *itself* against the ra-
 vages of *time*, the poet exclaims :

(p) If the feminine expression, *Dear my love*, be not
 sufficient to explain the meaning, let the Context
 decide the doubt.

" Now

" Now stand you on the top of *happy hours* ;
 " And, many *maiden gardens*, yet unset,
 " With *virtuous wish*, would bear you living *flowers*
 " Much liker, than your painted *counterfeit* (q)."

(q) The British Critic, vol. ix. 593. It is however, to be remembered, that the *you*, in the text of Mr. Malone is *your* in the *Original*, as he very properly remarks [Sup. vol. i. p. 595.] My opinion is, in opposition to the Commentators, that the original Copy was right, in printing "*your* living flowers," which ought not to have been changed, without authority. *Your* living flowers mean your living Children, in opposition to *your* painted *Counterfeit*, or portrait ; as *Counterfeit* then meant. The allusion is plainly to the many portraits of Elizabeth, which, having given her offence, were proscribed, by proclamation. "It is not quite so certain, that Shakspeare's *masculine love* had, then, been *counterfeited* by the pencil. From the dark conceit of the *maiden garden* and *living flowers* the poet goes on to urge :

" So should the *lines* of life, that life repair,
 " Which this (Time's pencil, or my pupil pen).
 " Neither in *inward worth*, nor *outward fair*
 " Can make you live yourself, in eyes of *Men*."

Mr. Malone, feeling the *darkness visible* of this Sonnet, suggests, that *lines* of life should be altered to *lives* of life. [Ib. 594.] But, the context supports the original: For *Time's pencil* could more naturally paint the *lines* [outlines, or sketches] of life, than *lives* of life. The Context, by mentioning *inward worth*, and *outward*

Shakspeare proceeds forward, by the natural progress of his purpose, to speak in his 17th Sonnet, of perpetuating "*the most high deserts*" of his love; to eternize "*the beauty of [her] eyes;*" and to *number, in fresh numbers, all [her] graces.* Can *prejudice*, whatever may be the blindness of *outward fair*, also shows the person addressed to have been a woman, since *fair* is not applied to a man, and points at Elizabeth, who was thereby praised for her *talents*: The Context, moreover, by telling her how she was to live in *eyes of men*, demonstrates, that the object addressed was not a man, who was to be exhibited as an object for the *eyes of men*. Shakspeare then proceeds to borrow a thought from Spenser, whose *Amoretti* he had constantly in *his head and hand*:

"To give away yourself, keeps yourself still,

"And you must live, drawn by your *own sweet skill*."

Spenser had argued, paradoxically, in his 65th Sonnet:

"The doubt, which ye misdeem, *fair love in vain*,

"That fondly fear to *lose your liberty*,

"When losing *one, two liberties* ye gain,

"And make him bound, that bondage erst did fly."

It was the *paradox*, which Shakspeare borrowed: To *give*, and to *keep* at the same moment: To be *free*, to be *fast*, and to fasten at the same time. To the Anonymous Critic before mentioned, I will repeat, that to hang the old clothes of forced meanings, upon the *pegs* of detached lines, is a task, which ought to be despised, for its facility; and to defy the Context requires more boldness than modesty and candour allow.

his

his intellect, apply the feminine epithets, *grace of person*, and *beauty of eye*, to a man, or appropriate to any other personage than Elizabeth, the super-eminent praise of "*most high deserts*." The poet is carried forward, by the consistency of his context, to compare the great object of his adoration, in his 18th Sonnet, "to a Summer's day;" and to commend her "as more lovely, and "more temperate:" and, assuming a higher tone, in his 19th Sonnet, and addressing himself to "swift-footed Time," he cries out:

But, I forbid thee one most heinous crime:

"O! Carve not, with the hours, *my love's fair brow*;

"Nor, draw no lines, *there*, with thine antique pen:

"*Him*, [fair brow] in thy course, untainted, do allow,

"For *beauty's pattern*, to succeeding Men.

"Yet; do thy worst, old Time: Despite thy wrong,

"My love shall, in my verse, *ever live young* (r)".

But

(r) Among a thousand objections, which the said Anonymous Critic makes [British Critic, vol. ix. p. 516] not only, without Authority, but what is of still more weight, against *The fact*, he asks: Is it credible that Shakspeare, knowing "Elizabeth to be much older, should pretend to speak of *forty*, as a future time, and a distant

But, not to dwell on smaller circumstances, the anonymous Critic aforesaid proceeds to consider the 20th Sonnet, which, with characteristic prudery, he deems too indecent to have been presented to Elizabeth, and too bad to be laid before the public, at present. Without repeating my arguments, and facts, which prove, that this Sonnet was not addressed to a man, and is not obscene, I will only add; knowing the Critic, and his purpose:

"The graver prude sinks downward to a gnome,"

"In search of mischief, still on earth to roam."

After such minute examinations of some of the most difficult of Shakspeare's Sonnets, "distant future." For the more retired life, and personal habits, of Queen Elizabeth, I had quoted Lord Orford's Cat. of Royal, and Noble, Authors, art. Essex; Hume's Hist. vol. v. p. 526; Whitaker's Vind. of Mary Q. of Scots, vol. ii. throughout; which demonstrate, that she *daunced* as a young girl, at sixty five; that she was treated by subjects, and foreigners, as an object of desire, at an older age: Spenser addressed his *Amoretti* to Elizabeth, in 1595, when she was entering into her *grand Climacteric*: Why, then, is Shakspeare to be deprived of the privilege of poetic fiction, in feigning Elizabeth to be only twenty-three, when she was sixty three? Or that, in despite of Time, his Love should, in his verse, ever live young!!

it

it cannot be reasonably expected, that I should inspect one hundred more, with the same elaboration, that I have tried to explain those encomiastic effusions, which have been deemed the most obscure. In justification of my own preconceptions, and in answer to objections, I have ascertained such facts, shown such a concatenation of circumstances, and produced such arguments, in support of the whole, as ought to confound prejudice, and to settle judgment. If I should not, however, have assigned the proper meanings to the conceits of Shakspeare, in his most difficult Sonnets, it will not follow, from my failure, in not comprehending unintelligibility, that I am wrong in my position, as to his real object; or that those critics are right, in their opinions; who, like Warburton, have assigned to this great Poet motives, which never moved him, and thoughts, that never entered his mind. I have not undertaken the hard task of commenting on Shakspeare's Sonnets, of clearing his obscurities, or of decyphering his conceits:

G

But

But, my inability to perform, what seems to be beyond human capacity, does not enfeeble the strength of my proofs, in support of the main position, that those amatory Verses were addressed by Shakspeare to Elizabeth.

Of those Amatory Verses, it may be truly said, that as a whole poem, which is often tied together by a very slight ligature, they have two of the worst faults, that can degrade any writing; they are obscure; and they are tedious. Spenser, who furnished the model of them, has his obscurities, and tediousness; but he has withal, more distinctness, in his topicks, and more facility, in his style: Shakspeare plainly endeavoured to go beyond the mark of his rivalry; but, in affecting the sublime, he sunk, by a natural cadence, into the unintelligible. Spenser having no rival, and only a single object, caught at such topicks of praise, as he thought would please the most, and adopted such a style, as he could most easily manage. Of such a poet, as Shakspeare, it may easily be conceived, that he has many happy phrases, and elegant lines, though they are generally darkened

darkened by conceit, and marred by affectation; with as many happy phrases, and elegant lines, Spenser has fewer conceits and less affectation; having from inheritance, as fruitful a garden of images, which he watered from a deeper fountain of learning. Shakspeare, "fancy's sweetest child," shows sometimes a manifest superiority in *imagination* over Spenser, when this wonderful poet is forming the same images. By an effort of his creative powers, Shakspeare appears to have carried away the palm, in this great quality of a true poet, from his illustrious rival, even when Spenser put forth his whole strength, in cultivating the same field. The following is Shakspeare's 99th Sonnet, which was plainly written, in emulation of Spenser's 64th :

- " The forward violet, thus did I chide :
 " Sweet thief, whence didst thou steal, thy sweet, that
 " smells,
 " If not from my love's breath ? The purple pride,
 " Which, on thy soft cheek, for complexion dwells,
 " In my love's veins, thou hast too grossly dy'd.
 " The lily, I condemned, for *thy* hand ;
 " And buds of marjoram had stol'n *thy* hair :
 " The roses fearfully on thorns did stand ;
 " One blushing shame, another white despair ;

" A third, nor red, nor white, had stol'n of both,

" And, to *his* robbery had annex'd *thy* breath;

" But, for *his* theft, in pride of all *his* growth,

" A vengeful canker eat *him* up to death.

" More flowers, I noted: Yet in none could see,

" But, sweet, or colour, it had stol'n from thee (1)."

Yet, this poetical description of a charming woman is specifically declared, by the anonymous Critic aforesaid, to be one of the hundred and twenty-six Sonnets, which Shakspeare, with his *platonismic* pen, addressed to a MAN (1). When, " in the

(1) With the above, compare the 64th Sonnet of Spenser, as follows:

" Coming to kiss her lips (such grace I found)

" Me seem'd I smelt a garden of sweet flowers,

" That dainty odours from them threw around,

" For damsels fit to deck their lovers bowres.

" Her lips did smell like unto gilliflowers,

" Her ruddy Cheeks, like unto roses red,

" Her snowy brows like bended bellamours,

" Her lovely eyes, like pinks but newly spread.

" Her goodly bosom, like a strawberry bed,

" Her neck like to a bunch of columbines,

" Her breath like lilies, ere their leaves be shed,

" Her nipples, like young blossom'd jessamines:

" Such fragrant flowres do give most odorous smell;

" But, her sweet Odour did them all excell."

(2) British Critic, vol. ix. 515—17.

orient

“*orient*, the gracious light lifts up his
 “*burning head*,” the said critic asserts, that
 it is only the evening Star, setting in dark-
 ness; when lightening flashes conviction on
 the intellect, the critical beholder insists,
 that it is only a *Will-of-the-Wisp*, playing
 its delusive coruscations; and when the con-
 text comes in to settle every doubt, by the
 decisiveness of its inferences, the aforesaid
 Critic assumes, for argument, that assertion
 is more credible, than fact, and certainty
 less convincing, than speculation.

The said Critic produces, however, some-
 thing like proof, not, indeed, of the Son-
 nets being addressed to a man, the object of
 the poet's *platonism*, but of the poet's pre-
 dilection for an *infant*, by quoting the 126th
 Sonnet, which begins:

“O! thou, my lovely *boy*, who, in thy power,
 “Dost hold time's *fickle glass*, his *fickle hour*.”

Yet, would the same Critic have done well,
 when affecting a solicitude for truth, to have
 published the *whole truth*. “This Son-
 “net,” says Mr. Malone, “differs from
 “all the others in the present collection, not
 “being written in alternate rhimes.” Mr.

Steevens adds, that "this Sonnet only consists of twelve lines (u)." The original edition marks more strongly this essential deficiency of the two lines, which contained the explanatory point of the Sonnet. Mr. Malone has corrected another defect of this Sonnet, by printing *Minutes*, in his Edition, for *Mynuit* in the original. These deficiencies prove, with full conviction, that the printer had before him a very imperfect Manuscript, which shews neither the last hand, nor the full meaning of the author. We see, indeed, in the *twelve lines*, such as we have them, that the poet gave *lovers* to the *boy*; and wooed *him-she* to wed, by telling him, that as he grows fast, he will soon grow old; in prophetic contempt of Mr. Malone's argument, before-mentioned; and in anticipating defiance of the aforesaid Critic's *platonism*. As we have been thus deprived of the poet's key, which would have opened the genuine design of the whole Sonnet, we must suspend our opinions, till we know the

(u) Sup. vol. i. p. 681.

writer's last words, and trust to the context, in judging of his real purpose (x).

(x) In his 115th Sonnet, indeed, we meet with the same thought, and even the same words :

"*Love is a babe; then, might I not say so,*

"*To give full growth, to that which still doth grow.*"

From the Context, then, I am led to suspect, that in the 126th Sonnet, the poet meant merely to say : Oh ! thou, my *baby love*. This same *boy babe*, or *baby boy*, is spoken of as a God, in the 110th Sonnet : After speaking of his object, as "*my best of love*," he goes on to infer, that the same object is, "*a God, in love, to whom I am confined :*"

"*Then, give me welcome; next, my heaven, the best;*

"*Even to thy pure, and most, most loving, breast.*"

The poet had brought forward this thought from the preceding Sonnet :

"*As from my Soul, which, in thy breast, doth lie,*

"*That is my home of love.*"

Of the conceits about *Love*, in the pages of poetry, there is no end ! I have not undertaken to explain all Shakspeare's fantastical notions on this fruitful topick : My only endeavour has been, to make his own Context explain his own purpose, and his own meaning ; to free him from inconsistency ; and to settle his sense. Shakspeare himself was only, throughout his Sonnets, what

"*— all true lovers are,*

"*Unfraid, and skittish, in all motions else,*

"*Save, in the constant image of the Creature,*

"*That is belov'd.*"

We may see indeed, another *infant introduced* by Shakspeare, in his 124th Sonnet, only two Sonnets preceding: He, herein, cries out:—

- “ If my *dear love* were *but* the *child* of *State*,
- “ It might, for fortune's bastard be unfather'd,
- “ As subject to time's love, or to time's hate :
- “ No; it was *builded* far from accident ;
- “ It suffers not in smiling pomp, nor falls
- “ Under the blow of thrall'd discontent,
- “ Whereto the inciting time our fashion calls ;
- “ It fears not *policy*, that *heretick* ;
- “ But, all *alone* stands *hugely* *politick*.”

Now, was not Queen Elizabeth *the child of State* ? And, is she not described, in the subsequent lines, as distinctly as if she had been named ? The poet has plainly, in his mind, a *Child of State*, which *all alone stands hugely politick* : And he is carried forward, by a natural course of thought, to describe what he had observed, at *Court* :

- “ Have I not seen dwellers on *form* and *favour*
- “ Loose all, and more, by paying too much rent,
- “ For compound sweet, foregoing simple favour ?
- “ Pitiful thrivers, in their gazing spent ! ”

From his *Child of State* in the 124th Sonnet, and the *Court*, and *Courtiers*, in the 125th, Shakspeare went forward, with these

these thoughts in his mind, to his *lovely boy*, the *minion of nature*, the *Sovereign mistress*, in the 126th to whom he assigns *power*, and *lovers*; and going into the Exchequer, the poet talks of *treasure*, of the *audit*, and of the *quietus*, which follows the *render of accounts*. Shakspeare has still *some association of ideas* in his mind: From *Time's glass*, and the *fickle hour*, in the 126th Sonnet, it was natural for him to cast a retrospective glance on *the old age*, when *black was not counted fair*; at least, it was not applied to *beautie's name*: And, he was led on to think, in good earnest, of *his mistress*, "whose eyes
" are raven black (y)." on *boothman*

(y) "All the remaining Sonnets, says Mr. Malone, are addressed to *a female*;" [Sup. vol. i. p. 682] and, the aforesaid Anonymous Critic joins in this affirmation, calculating the Estimate from the 126th Sonnet, which talks of *the boy*: Yet, it still remains to be proved; rather than asserted, that the whole of Shakspeare's Sonnets, from No. 1, to 126, inclusive, were addressed to a man, with a *platonic* regard. On the contrary, I have proved, I trust, that the whole of Shakspeare's Sonnets were addressed by him to a woman; to a great woman; to Queen Elizabeth; and I have thereby freed our illustrious poet, I hope, from the odious imputation of *platonism*.

We

We are induced, by this disquisition about *the object*, to whom these Sonnets were, originally, addressed, to enquire what Critic, or Commentator, first asserted, that they were addressed to a *Man*. These Sonnets, as they were plainly written in emulation of Spenser's *Amoretti*, which were published, in 1595, were probably written, in 1596, or 1597, when Shakspeare was two, or three, and thirty. They were handed about, in Manuscript, among his *private friends*, as we are told by Meres; and were deemed very fine, at least, very *sweet* (2); the object, and the allusions, being then understood, no doubt. They were not printed, during the life of Elizabeth; because, probably the poet did not obtain permission from that fairest prude. They were published, however, by Thorpe, from an

(2) Meres, in his *Wits Treasury*, 1598, calls them Shakspeare's *Sugred Sonnets*. I observe, that Fabian, the Chronicler, in giving a Character of Henry 7th, speaks of his *sugred eloquence*. [Rastal, 1533.] Sir Philip Sydney talks of the *sugred invention* of Heliodorus, in that picture of love, in *Theagines and Cariclea*. [Apologie for Poetrie. 1595.]

imperfect

imperfect Copy, which may have come into the hands of W. H. who gave it to the Bookseller, without the apparent consent of the author. But, there was no intimation, to whom they were addressed, except that Thorpe dedicated them to W. H. as the only *begetter* (a) of these sonnets. This poem was re-published by Cotes, in 1640, without a commentary. Gildon republished these Sonnets, in 1710, which, he asserted, "to be *all of them in praise of his mistress*;" as the editor adds in his Title-page. When Doctor Sewell re-published these Sonnets, in 1728, he improved, by a poetic fiction, on this statement of Gildon: "A *Young muse*," says the Doctor, "must have a *mistress*, to play off the beginning of fancy; nothing being so apt to elevate the Soul to a pitch

(a) See Minshew, 1616, in vo. *to beget*, signifying in one sense, to *bring forth*. W. H. was the bringer forth of the Sonnets. *Beget* is derived by Skinner from the A. S. *begettan*, *obtinere*. Johnson adopts this derivation, and sense: so that *begetter*, in the quaint language of Thorpe, the Bookseller, Pistol, the *ancient*, and such affected persons, signified the *obtainer*; as to *get*, and *getter*, in the present day, means *obtain*, and *obtainer*, or to procure, and the procurer.

" of

“ of poetry, as the passion of Love (b).”
 Theobald talked of re-publishing the Poems of Shakspeare; but lived not to perform what has since been done by an abler hand (c). With the twenty plays of Shakspeare, in quarto, Mr. Steevens published, literally, in 1766, *the Sonnets*, from the original Edition of Thorpe, but without any observations. At length, in 1780, Mr. Malone formally published, in his Supplement to the Edition of Shakspeare, 1773, *the Sonnets* and other poems, of the great Dramatist, with the Editor’s own remarks, and the notes of his friends. It was now, for the first time, said expressly by Mr. Malone, that Shakspeare had addressed 120 of these Sonnets to a *Man*;

(b) The Preface, p. vii. It must however be constantly kept in mind, that Shakspeare was not a *young* muse, in 1596; and that he had a wife, with a daughter, who was ready to elevate the soul of any other poet, or *physician*, to a *pitch of poetry*: In fact, this daughter married Doctor Hall, on the 5th of June 1607.

(c) In Jortin’s Miscel. Observ. upon Authors, ancient and modern, 1732, vol. ii. p. 242, there are what have not been much observed, some remarks of Theobald on *the poems* of Shakspeare, but not the *Sonnets*.

Mr.

Mr. Steevens, on reading the 20th Sonnet, affirmed, that it was addressed to a *male object* (d).

These two commentators, then, were the first, who, from the most egregious misconception of the poet's object, and meaning, originally wounded the fair fame of Shakspeare. And last, though not least, the anonymous Critic, before mentioned, who, as I have before observed, is *very german* to one of those Commentators, was the first, who asserted, that Shakspeare addressed those 126 Sonnets to a *Man* "with
" *a romantic Platonism of Affection, (e).*"

It

(d) Sup. vol. i. p. 579, 596.

(e) British Critic, vol. ix. 517. I have already proved that the strongest support, which is brought for this odious suggestion, "that it was a *fault of Youth,*" is *unfounded*, by shewing that the Poet was two-and-thirty, when he wrote his Sonnets; having a Wife, and Children, to care for, and many avocations to occupy him: The other support, that they were written at a time "when very romantic addresses to friends were not "uncommon," is equally groundless: For, the romantic addresses consisted more in words than matter; and appear more romantic to us, owing to the alteration in the import of words: When Ben Johnson subscribed
himself

It was reserved for me to declare, for the first time, in the *Apology*, with *all the wildness*

himself the true *lover* of Camden, the true Lover of Richard Martin, he meant merely to say your affectionate friend. Take an example of two very intimate friends, Edmond Spenser, and Gabriel Harvey, from the following Sonnet, which has not been re-published in *The Works* of Spenser :

" To the Right worshipful, my singular good *friend*,
Mr. Gabriel Harvey, Doctor of the Laws :

" Harvey, the happy above happiest men

" I read: that sitting like a looker on

" Of this world's stage, doest note with critique pen

" The sharp dislikes of each condition :

" And as one careless of suspicion,

" Ne fawnest for the favour of the great :

" Ne fearest foolish reprehension

" Of faulty men, which danger to thee threat.

" But freely doest, of what thee list, entreat,

" Like a great Lord of peerless liberty :

" Lifting the good up to high honours seat,

" And the Evil damning ever more to dy.

" For life, *and* death is [are] in thy doomsful writing :

" So thy renowne lives ever by endighting."

Dublin: this xvij of July, 1586 :

Your devoted *friend*, during life,

Edmund Spenser.

[From *Four Letters and Certain Sonnets*, especially touching Robert Greene." Published by Gabriel Harvey, in 1592. p. 75.]

of *Conceit*, that Shakspeare addressed his Sonnets to Elizabeth. For this declaration, I assigned such reasons, as satisfied my mind, at the time: I have reviewed the whole question, which, considering the parties, an illustrious Queen, and a great Poet, is very interesting: And I now submit such an argument, as, I believe, cannot be easily answered, except by asserting what ought to be proved, and by furnishing what ought to be defended by argument.

Yet, it is said, by the Critic before-mentioned; that, "when Mr. C. undertakes to
 " prove, as he calls it, that the Sonnets of
 " Shakspeare were addressed to that Princess,
 " he certainly takes up one of the *wildest*
 " *Conceits* that ever arose in any mind (f)." Now; I join issue on the *Wildness of the Conceit*: And, I appeal to Mr. Locke, Bishop Butler, and Lord Chief Baron Gilbert, as competent judges of the theory of Logick, and of the practice of reasoning. I will repeat, on this occasion, till I have taught the Cuckatoos of London, to hoot it in the ears of Critics.

what was finely said by Bishop Butler, that
 PROBABILITY is the GUIDE of LIFE.

With *this guide* before us, let us enquire, which of the parties entertain the *wildest conceit*. First, Is it most probable, that Shakspeare, all circumstances considered, addressed One hundred and twenty-six Amatory Sonnets to a *man*, or to a *woman*? The answer must be, if drawn from common life, and from sound reason, to a woman; because men usually make love to women; and woo them to wed. Secondly, But, the Critic states it, as a *fact*, that those Sonnets are addressed to a *man*: It must be admitted, indeed, that if this position were true, it would decide the point in issue: The position, however, is neither true, as a *fact*, nor admissible, as a *probability*: And, taking into consideration, according to the custom of true Critics, and the practice of accurate judges, the object of the writer, his context, and his language, which last is perplexed from the uncertainty of the *relatives*, and the *antecedents*, it will manifestly appear, that the whole of those Sonnets were addressed

to

to a woman. Thirdly, the Critic assigns *platonism*, as the *motive* of Shakspeare; the *platonism* of *youth*: But, was he a *Youth*? The answer is, he was two-and-thirty, a married man, and a father. The Critic tries to support his assertion, by saying, that there were, in that age, very romantic addressees to friends in the world: Yet, admitting this to be true, he fails, in not producing any proof, that Shakspeare made such amatory addressees to the dearest friends: The friends, and *fellows*, of Shakspeare, appear in his *Testament*. From this examination, the *platonism*, assigned, appears to be only assertion, without proof, assumption, without authority, sophistry, without sense, and presumption, against probability. Fourthly, Does not Mr. Malone *assert*, that one hundred and twenty Sonnets are addressed, by the poet, to a *man*? Yes: but, does not Mr. Gildon, with *probability*, for his support, assert, that the Sonnets were addressed to the poet's *mistress*: Does not Mr. Steevens break out into indignation, when he saw Shakspeare court his *master-mistress*? Yes:

H

but,

but, did not Doctor Sewell, who was also an editor of Shakspeare, and was not frightened by a phantom, assert, that the Sonnets were addressed to the poet's *mistress*; adding, as a proof, what has *some sense*, "the young
"muse must have his *mistress*:" Mr. Gildon, and Doctor Sewell, talked, like men of this *earth*: Mr. Malone, and Mr. Steevens speak, like men of some other *planet*: Nor, did there appear to Mr. Gildon, and Doctor Sewell, any thing obscene, in the 20th Sonnet, which has, indeed, no appearance of obscenity, if it be chastely examined, by a chaste mind; taking the words, as they were then understood, without listening to the suggestions of *platonism*. Such are the arguments, which have been adduced by Commentators, and Critics, for shewing, in the *probation* of *The Apologist* "the *Wildest*
"Conceit, that ever arose in any mind!"

On the other hand, the *probation* of *The Apologist* may be thus arranged, by the *guide* of *probability*: First, Shakspeare, who as he was born in 1564, was two-and-thirty, in 1596, married early, and soon had children;

he

he had moreover an old father to care for, and younger brothers to help into life: Whence, it is inferable, that he had nearer objects of affection, than any mere connection of friendship. Secondly, Shakspeare was by profession a public writer, whose livelihood depended, chiefly, on the product of his pen: Whence, we may infer, that he had no leisure to sing the praises of women, much less to woo, by amatory verses, the affections of men. Thirdly, Shakspeare had a vigilance of observation, which did not allow life to glide unheeded by him: he noted, accordingly, the passages of the times; he saw the rise, and fall, of Courtiers; he remarked the success, and distinguished the characters of writers; though Spenser seems to be the only poet, whom he honoured by denominative praise. Fourthly, He saw men of fewer talents, than he had, raised by adulation; he perceived poets of less genius, than he possessed, elevated by their flatteries; he felt the "vulgar scandal stamped upon his brow," while in the practice of providing, by *public means*, for *daily life*: And

he was, in this manner, incited by emulation, and pressed by interest, to adopt their means, for obtaining similar ends. Fifthly, He saw Spenser, the greatest poet of his time, address many laudatory verses to Elizabeth, and profit from them: And Shakspeare was thus induced to turn his view to "the lovely gaze, where every eye doth dwell." Knowing a *better spirit had used her name*, he tried, by his encomiastic emulations (g), "to thrive," as he had thriven. Sixthly, During the years 1596, and 1597, when Shakspeare wrote his Sonnets (h), he was occupied as a player, and busied as a dramatist; who wrote, or revised, in every year, several Comedies, Tragedies, or Histories; and he had, consequently, no leisure to write such Sonnets to a common man, or an ordinary woman: But, he was induced by two of the most powerful motives of mankind, emulation, and interest, to court Elizabeth, his (i) *all-the-world*, who alone

(g) Son. 21, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, all allude to Spenser's *Amoretti*; and the 10th Sonnet refers minutely to the *Faerie Queene*.

(h) Son. 111, 112. (i) Son. 112.

had

had power to wipe the "vulgar scandal from his brow," to provide better for his life, than by public means; and who alone had authority "to 'oer-green his bad, his good allow." Seventhly, Knowing that lovers, both natural, and political, had, for thirty years, wooed Elizabeth to wed, and having poetic license, Shakspeare feigned love for her, like Raleigh, and Spenser; and courted the "*world's fresh ornament*," by appropriate topicks, which a most fruitful imagination alone could furnish; and which fitly applied to no other person on earth, than to her, who was *beloved of many* (*k*); who had *most high deserts* (*l*); who was endeared with *all hearts*; whose commendation was "too excellent for every vulgar paper to rehearse" (*m*): But, can the previous probability, which results from all those intimations, be confirmed, by collateral circumstances? Yes; Queen Elizabeth is so plainly described in many of the Sonnets, (*n*) as to shew,

(*k*) Son. 10. (*l*) Son. 17, 31. (*m*) Son. 38.

(*n*) In order to see this truth most distinctly, we must attend to the 1st Sonnet: "Thou [the object] that art

shew, distinctly, the real object of the poet's praise to *one*, and of *one*, whose wondrous excellence

"now the world's fresh ornament," and the only Herald to the gaudy spring; whereof the *topicks*, and the words were copied from Spenser. [Son. 70.] See Son. 2. Thy [the object] Youth's proud livery, lo gaz'd on now. In the fictions, poetical, and political, of that age, Elizabeth was considered as *always young*. See Son. 3, 5, and 9, wherein, the poet speaks of a public, and private, widow. See Son. 10, 17, 20, 21, 23, wherein he speaks of looking for recompence. See Son. 26, 29, wherein he talks, spirit-edly, of scorning "to change his state with Kings." See Son. 31, and 36, wherein he speaks of his object honouring him with public kindness. See Son. 38, and 53, wherein speaking still of his object, he adds; "and you, in every blessed shape, we know." See Son. 55, 57, 58, 59, 61, wherein he hints at the well known jealousy of Elizabeth. See Son. 67, and 69, a very minute description of her, which was borrowed from Spenser's Son. 3, 15. See Son. 70, and 78, wherein he speaks of giving grace a double majesty. See Son. 70, wherein emulating Spenser's Son. 81, he speaks of her worth, as being as wide as the Ocean. See Son. 82, 86 and 87, wherein he feigns to have had Elizabeth, "as a dream doth flatter, in sleep, a King." See Son. 93, wherein he adopts the mythology of Spenser:

"But, heaven, in thy creation, did decree,

"That, in thy face, sweet love should ever dwell."

See

excellence his verses constantly commended ;
nay, such was *her worth* :

“ That we, which behold *these present days*,

“ Have eyes to wonder, but lack tongues to praise.”

Eighthly, If the *probability*, then, be confirmed, by the *fact*, the probation of the Apologist is completed : For, we must ever remember the lesson of the great masters of logick, that if there be some evidence, on one side of a proposition, and no evidence on the other side, every enquirer is bound, by the constitution of his own mind, to believe in *some* evidence, rather than in *none*.

“ To ‘cide this title is impanneled

“ A ‘quest of *thoughts* :”

And, the issue being joined, it remains only, for the jury to determine, who is most *conceitedly wild* ? They who produce no legitimate evidence at all ; or he, who, in a ques-

See Son. 96. wherein Elizabeth is minutely described ; talking of a *throned queen*, and of her conquests, if she would use the *strength* of all her *State*. See Son. 94, wherein the poet supposes himself to be *crowned with her*. And see Son. 124, wherein he describes her as *the Child of State*. The before quoted Sonnets are those, which, Mr. Malone, and Mr. Steevens assert, with a wonderful *wildness of conceit*, were addressed to a Man.

tion, which does not admit of demonstration, adduces proofs, that come as near to it as possible.

I owed this argument, with regard to the real object of Shakespeare's Sonnets, to the subject, which, as it relates to those extraordinary persons, Elizabeth, Spenser, and Shakspeare, is interesting in itself; to all the admirers of the illustrious dramatist, except the two Commentators, whose "ears are
" more deaf than adders to the voice of any
" true decision;" And, I also owed the foregoing argument to my own discovery, which, as I was the first to announce, I ought to be the last, in the field, to defend, against the assaults of Criticism, that merely dogmatizes, when it ought to prove, and only drivels, when it ought to reason.

In reviewing this head of my Apology, I find little to add, and nothing to retract. Having by the prefatory advertisement to that book acknowledged the whole of the Shakspeare-papers, which were exhibited, to be spurious, and the exhibition of them to be a cheat; I had no controversy with
Mr.

Mr. Malone about the genuineness of Queen Elizabeth's Letter. But, I did controvert both the matter, and the manner, of his *enquiry*: I still disapprove of that sort of morality, which would detect an acknowledged forgery, by any means: I will continue to explode all negative argument, which is in its nature nugatory, and, in its application, extremely fallacious. The *consistency* of *spelling*, which was relied upon, as existing in the age of Elizabeth, and Shakspeare; and as showing at once the forgery of the papers, and the ignorance of the Believers; was shewn to be only consistent in its inconsistency (o). In support of the negative argument, it was said, that the word *ande* with a final *e* could not be found; that *forre* could not be discovered; that *maister* was the only spelling of *master*; that *Chambe-layne* was

(o) Apology p. 69, 77. Add to this what is very justly said by the Editor of *The Nugæ Antiquæ*, vol. ii. Pref. viii: "The spelling has been preserved, for the most part, " and altho' the same persons spelt very differently, it was " thought necessary to adhere strictly to it, as a proof of " there being no standard, at this point of time, for writing the English language, with correct orthography."

unprecedented; that *Londonne* had never been seen; that *Leicester* was always written thus (*p*); that the verb *to compliment* did not exist, in that age; that the epithet *pretty* had never been applied to written compositions; that *ourself* could not be found, as an unity; that *excellence*, and *amuse*, were not then in good use, as the enquirer *more than suspects*; all those words were objected to, in those forms; in order to show, that a word does not exist in our language, because the Critic could not find it, in his lexicography: Yet, were all those assumptions disproved, with very unexpected fulness, to the great disgrace of *Index-learning*. To explode, effectually, negative arguments, is of some importance to critical reasoning: It was of still more importance, on this occasion; when negative arguments were continually brought into action, for the obvious purpose of obloquy. Censoriousness may be at length shamed into silence, by finding, that they,

(*p*) In Fabian's Chron. by Rastal, 1533, fol. CLXI, it is said: "This yere [1413] the Kyng helde his Parlyamento "at Leyceter."

who

who attempt to wound without a cause, generally receive in the conflict, "those wounds, [which] heal ill; men do give themselves." The Believers, nevertheless, acting on accurate principles of probability, and from the honest motives of curiosity, or amusement, may, with surer grounds than Woolsey, who thought himself traduced, by ignorant tongues, resolve, in his language:—

" ————— We must not stint

" Our necessary Actions, in the fear,

" To cope malicious Censurers (9)."

(9) At the Conclusion of the foregoing section, it was said [Apology, p. 123,] "that there were balloons, in the age of Elizabeth, and Shakspeare," although the Enquirer had taken it for granted, there were none, for the purpose of fixing the charge of *Anachronism*, on the believers; An additional proof of my position may be found in *The Philosophical Satyres*, of Robert Anton, 1616, p. 20:

"Pack fool to French *Baloon*, and there at play,

"Consume the progress of thy sullen day."

§ III. —
LORDSOUTHAMPTONANDHISCORRESPONDENCE.

I HAD no controversy with Mr. Malone about the *Letter* of Lord Southampton; having explicitly admitted (r) that it was spurious: But, on this head of the enquiry, as on several other points, I thought I had reason to controvert his mis-conceptions of

(r) On this point, the Anonymous Critic, before mentioned, writes [British Critic, vol. ix. p. 520] as follows: "we recollect but *one passage*, in which he expressly declares his opinion that *any one* of the papers is spurious." Common candour required, however, that there should have been added this exception, "that in the prefatory advertisement to the Apology, the *whole of the miscellaneous Papers were acknowledged to be spurious*; and the exhibition of them was declared to be a *Cheat*." The Critic, in the same strain, goes on to remark, that the Apologist "gives up the Letters of Lord Southampton and Shakspeare expressly, because he prefers, *we know not why*, one power of Attorney to two Letters." The Critic, then, cannot tell why the Apologist should adopt a *genuine* power of Attorney, as a *touchstone*, for trying the spurioufness of a Letter, which was said to be written by the Grantor of that power! I will apply to such a Critic, Marston's Dedication to *Detraction*:

"A canker'd verdict of malignant hate

"Shall ne'er provoke me, worse myself to deem."

OUR

our Archaiology; to dispute the assumptions, that were apparently made, for the purpose of misrepresenting the Believers; and to rectify the palpable errors, which his inattentive view of the Subject had introduced into the Life of Lord Southampton. All these Considerations were deemed objects of importance; as they related to Shakspeare's earliest Patron; and, what was of more importance, as the illustration of those several points tended to display the truth with the "blest effulgence" of the Sun in his meridian.

Now, the truth has been by nothing more obscured, than by the Enquirer's mis-conceptions, with regard to the Cecils; who are by him represented as the enemies of Lord Southampton, while the Earl of Essex, is said to have been his invariable friend. Sir Robert Cecil, as I have shown, was the active friend of Lord Southampton: Essex was his envious opponent, until he was converted by Lord Southampton's courtship of

Elizabeth

Elizabeth Vernon, his Cousin (s). Almost every striking incident, indeed, in the various Life of Lord Southampton, has been thrown into shade, by the unskilfulness of his biographer. This patron of Shakspeare was appointed, by Mr. Malone, Vice-Admiral of the fleet, which sailed under the General, Lord Essex against the Azores, in 1597. The fact is, that Lord Southampton, who went out a volunteer, at the age of twenty-four, in the Garland, was soon commissioned, by Essex, to command her. Sir William Monson has recorded Lord Southampton's conduct; which was more noted, for the bravery of youth, than the judgement of age (t). He was not well received at Court,

(s) In the Declaration of the Treason of the Earl of Essex, [sign. D,] it is said, "There were present, at this Council, the Earl of Southampton, with whom, in former times, he [Essex] had been at some *emulations*, and *differences*, at Court: But, after, Southampton, having married his Kinswoman, plunged himself wholly into his fortune," &c.

(t) Sir William Monson, who was an Admiral on this expedition, relates in his "Account of the Wars with Spain,"

Court, on his return; the Queen frowning on a Captain, who had sunk a Spanish Pinnace, without orders; in order to show her dissatisfaction with the General, who was unfit for such a service.

The Earl, ere long, gave stronger proofs, that he was equally unfit for a greater service, and equally unfortunate, in the appointment of Lord Southampton, as a General of Horse, as he had been two years before as a Captain of a frigate. Essex seems to have, early, resolved, on this measure,

"Spain," p. 38: "The Pinnace was a frigate of the Spanish fleet, who took the Garland for a galleon of their's; but seeing the flag of the Garland she tried to escape; and the Earl pursued her, *with the loss of some time*, when he should have followed the fleet; and therefore was desired to desist from that chace by Sir William Monson, who sent his boat after him: By a shot from my Lord, this frigate was sunk." The want of success in this expedition, Monson attributes to the want of experience and seamanship in the Earl of Essex. From the accurate account of Monson, we may observe, that Rowland White's News, about Lord Southampton's sinking a great man of war, is not to be altogether credited. [Apology 136.]

contrary

contrary to positive injunctions (u). It was in the Irish Campaign, of 1599, that a quarrel began, between Lord Southampton, and Lord Grey, which, for many years inflamed the spirits, and distracted the affairs, of both (x). The Campaign of Ireland, and the

(u) Ib. And see in the *Nugæ Antiquæ*, vol. ii. p. 29. A Letter from Essex to John Harrington, 1599: "I shall provide you to a Command of Horsemen in Conforte and Commande of the Earl of Southamptone. I will confer such advantages as are in my powre; for as moche as hir Majestie makethe me to commande peace, or ware, to truce, parley, or such matter as seemethe beste for hir realme: Be nowe assurede of my *love* for hir sake, who byds it," &c.

(x) The cause of that quarrel may be seen in Sir John Harrington's Journal of the Campaign: [*Nugæ Antiq.* vol. ii. 33.] "About the same tyme, the rebell presented himself, in the sight of the Castle of Reban, whiche upon the sight of the Earl of Southampton, who hastened towards them in moſte ſoldier-like order, retyred themselves to their bogges: There, the Lo. Greye, being carried nearer to the rebell, by heate of valour naturall to ſuche yeeres and nobilitie then was reasonable, and contrary to the Commaundmente of the Earle of Sowthampton, was for his contempte, puniſhed by the Lord Leiufetennaunte wſthe a nyghtes imprisonment!"

We

the influence of Essex, involved Lord Southampton in treasonable consultations, open rebellion, and adjudged treason, during the unfortunate year 1601.

King James, contrary to his usual logick, seems to have thought, that the attack of Essex, on the power of Elizabeth, was the establishment of his own authority. He had hardly heard of his accession, when he sent orders to release Lord Southampton from the Tower. (y) In return, Lord Southampton hastened to meet the King, on his journey, from Edinburgh to London: And, on the 24th of April, 1604, Lord Southampton carried the sword before the King, as he made his public entry into Huntingdon. (z) Such

We may, herein see, also, Essex's Southamptons, and Harrington's Southampton, exclusive of other diversities of Spelling.

(y) I had hopes of being able to present a Copy of the letter, which King James wrote, on that occasion, to the Privy Council, for the delivery of Lord Southampton, and Sir Henry Nevil, and which existed among the *Ashmole MSS.* at Oxford; but, upon asking for a Copy, I was told, that the volumn, containing it, was mislaid.

(z) Chron. Pub. Edin. 1633, p. 163.

are the additional facts, which I have been able to collect, for freeing the biography of Lord Southampton from error, and misrepresentation. I will only add, that there is in *Purchas, his Pilgrimes*, vol. iv. p. 1788, a paper, signed, "HENRY Southampton;" and, in Camden's *Remains*, 1605, p. 156, the following *Anagram* of the Earl's name: Henricus Wriothfleius, *Heroicus, Lætus, vi virens*: In Sir John Beaumont's *Poems*, 1629, p. 176, there is an Elegy "on the death of the most noble lord Henry, Earle of Southampton, 1624;" and in p. 180, there is "An Epitaph upon that hopeful young Gentleman, the lord Wriothsley:"—

"What helpe can men against pale death provide,

"When twice, within few days, Souampton dide."

The facts, and the dates, which I have now stated, and formerly furnished, with regard to the life of the first patron of Shakespeare, will probably be useful to the Biographer; as some writers find it very difficult to prove what is self-evidently true. Of this singular truism, the whole *Enquiry*
of

of Mr. Malone, is an irrefragable proof. His great object is to prove, that fictitious papers are false. I explicitly admitted, by one general acknowledgement, that the papers, in question, were spurious. But, I disputed the legitimacy of the proofs, which were adduced by Mr. Malone, in order to prove them so; because, they appeared to be as defective as the papers; and to be brought forward, full as much for the purpose of obloquy, as for the investigation of truth.

To the correspondence of Lord Southampton, and Shakspeare, it was objected, by the Enquirer, that there was a tradition existing, in dramatical history, of a present of a thousand pounds, which had been given by the Peer to the Poet. From this tradition, the Believers argued, that the letter, for which there existed an Archetype, was probably true: on the other hand, the Sceptics, from the same premises, inferred, that the papers were unquestionably spurious. In confirmation of this inference, the Enquirer insisted, that the spellings were such as no age could show: As a compleat

answer, the Apologist showed, that there never had been any uniform orthography, in any age (a).

The Enquirer went on to object to the reduplication of the *ll* in *bllossoms*, and *bllooms*; and, when he was shewn, that there remain to this day, in English speech, analagous reduplications, he insisted, that Shakspeare was too good a gardener, not to know, that shrubs bloom before they blossom: But, in

(a) The anonymous Critic before mentioned asserts, however, that there is in the spurious papers a *regular system* of "Orthography;" admitting in the same breath "that there are variations." [British Critic, vol. ix. 520] Nay; of such hot, and cold, satire-like criticism out of the same mouth there is no end. If there be variations, there is no system; and if there be no system, then, the Criticism is nothing to the purpose. Mr. Malone objected 1st to the spelling of *forre*, as unprecedented; for which spelling, however, a precedent was found: he 2dly objected to the spelling of *for*, in this correspondence, between Southampton and Shakspeare, which showed a deviation from a supposed system: These, then, are happy specimens of *Procrustic Criticism*: If there be two *r*'s one of them is lopped off; if there be only one *r*, another must be added, for the unfair purpose of raising unfounded objections.

answer

answer to the objection, which was thus drawn from the garden, it was shewn, that Shakspeare was too good a philologist not to know, that *blooms*, and *blossoms* are mere *Synonyma*. (b) The Enquirer's objections, both to the coarseness of the beginning, and the familiarity of the end of his correspondence, were shown to be equally unfounded. (k) He only exposed his want of reading, when he impugned the word *Dear* as a familiar novelty: Sydney dedicated his *Arcadia*, in the following terms: "To my *Dear* Lady, and Sister, the Countess of Pembroke, most *dear*, and most wor-

(b) Apology 161: and See Capel's Notes on Shak. vol. iii. p. 18. l. 15. In Chaucer's *Court of Love*, as quoted by Mr. Malone [5. Shak. 263.] it is said that early on May Day—"furth goth al the Court both most "and lest, to fetch the flouris fresh, and *braunch*, "and *blome*." We may, herein, see, how Chaucer, who was an excellent poetical gardener, put the *braunch* before the *blome*.

(k) The objection to *Willam* is opposed by the Letter of Richard 3d, in Lord Orford's *Historic Doubts*, p. 118, about Mistress Shore, the wife of *Willm* Shore.

“thy to be most *dear* Lady.” And, take the following from Du Bartas :—

“How fair art thou, my *Deer*! How *dear* to me!

“*Dear* Soule (awake), I faint, I sinke, I sownde!

“At thy *dear* sight.” (l)

As, if there had been any uniform spelling, in that unprecise period of our language, it was finally objected to *freynd*, that it was not the spelling of the age. In superaddition to all former answers, let the following be subjoined :—

“*Frendes* have Y fewe my foemen walketh thykke.” (m)

Sir Robert Cecil assured the Vice Chancellor of Cambridge, that he was his *loving frend*: The Bishop of London told the same Vice Chancellor, that he was his *loving freind*. (n)

Amidst all this want of uniformity, one thing is certain, that he, who accuses others of ignorance, ought himself to be better instructed. To have been led into error by *probability* is sufficiently mortifying to those, who know the value of probability, as a guide: But, to be scoffed at, by ignorance, for the want of information about

(l) Silvester's Translation, 579.

(m) Hern's *Avesbury*, 265.

(n) Lewis's Translation of the Bible.

those

those things, that were of use for them to know, is a still harder lot, which requires "the better fortitude of patience," one of the firmest support of a "a clear life."

— § IV. —

SHAKSPEARE'S LETTER; AND VERSES TO ANNA
HATHERREWAYE.

IN every contest, there is a point of prudence, which a wise man will be studious to observe; and which prompts him never to take an untenable position; because the opponent is sure to attack what is weak, rather than what is strong. He, who assumed the task of convicting the *Shaksperianisms* of forgery, fell into this unhappiness, throughout his enquiry: He started a thousand objections, which, as they were founded neither in fact, nor in argument, were, by the Apologist, either confuted, as fictions, or exploded as sophisms.

In this manner, was every one of his objections, on this head of the enquiry, minutely examined, and satisfactorily refuted. When the enquirer said, that such a name as

Anna did not then exist, in our language, he showed little of his learning, and still less of his discretion. If it had not existed before in our Bibles, in our Dictionaries, in our Dramas, it must have been introduced, by the accession of King James, with Queen Anne :

“ With these, to celebrate the genial feast

“ Of *Anna*, stil’d *Perenna*, (a) Mars his guest.

Had the enquirer looked into Ben Jonson, he would have learned “ that he had devised the name of *Bel-Anna*, the Royal Queen of the Ocean ; and kept up the fame, in all his poems, wherein he mentioned Her Majesty (b).” But, *Bel-Anna* is not the only device of Ben upon Her Majesty’s name : In his *Triumph* of 1604, he has *Ori-ana*, which Whalley, most learnedly, expounds to be *quasi Oriens-Anna* (c). In emulation, no doubt, of Shakspeare’s

(a) See Ben Jonson’s Works 1640, the King’s entertainment, in passing to his Coronation, p. 80, a profusion of curious learning on the great feast of *Anna-Perenna*, the 15th of March.

(b) Whalley’s Edit, vol. v. 348.

(c) Ib. 205.

Anna,

Anna, Ben Jonson tried to go beyond him in encomiastic fiction: Not content with *Bel-Anna*, and *Ori-ana*, he created *Orian*:

" See, see, O see, who, here, is come, a maying,

" The Master of the Ocean;

" And his beauteous *Orian* (d) :"

Scepticism is the *ignis fatuus*, which continually leads into the mire, the Enquirer, who deals in *doubting things*. Thither, did it lead Mr. Malone, when he doubted, whether the *Cedar-tree* grew in England, at the accession of King James. The true question was, whether it existed in the pages of our poets. Even Gawen Douglas mentions

(d) The entertainment of the King and Queen at Sir William Cornwallis's house, at Highgate, on May-day, 1604. [Whalley, vol. v. 217.] And see Heminge Chart. Ecc. Wigorn. vol. i. p. 289, for *Anna*: and Dugdale's Bar. vol. i. 348, in the Table of Berkley. See Blathwayte's Poems, 1621. p. 67, for *Anna*: And Heywood's Dramas, 1637, p. 203, a Dialogue between *Anna*, and *Phillis*, and in p. 265, an Acrostic on Robert-*Anna-Carr*: In the Epistle to the reader may also be seen the Verb "*to compliment*;" "*Complement*, I cannot," says Heywood, the Contemporary of Shakspeare. This collection of curious learning, Mr. Malone missed, by doubting the existence of the name of *Anna*.

the

the *Cedir-tre* in his commendation of *maist reverend Virgil*. Sydney, and Spenser, often sing of the *Cedar*. Shakspeare adopted this fine passage in his *Henry VIth* :

“ Thus, yields the *Cedar* to the *Axe's* edge,”
from Marlow, who furnished Nixon with the very thoughts, and words, which Mr. Malone doubted the existence of, in Shakspeare's Epistle :

“ The *lowly shrub* doth *seldome blaste*, or *fade*
“ Under the *Cedar's* loftie verdant shade. (e).”

Thus,

(e) See Anthony Nixon's Dedication to Archbishop Whitgift of his *Christian Navy*, 1602. Nixon mentions the *Stately Eagle*, which shows, that he had his Eye on Marlow's *True Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke*, which was reprinted, in 1600. Shakspeare's Drama of *Henry 6th* was not published till 1623. In the Dedication of *The Strange, wonderful and bloody battel betweene Frogs and Mice*, 1603, by Wm. Fowldes to Rob. Greenwood, we may see :

“ No loftie Cedar, though in height he pass,
“ Eche sev'ral plant, which deserts forests yeeld.

Mr. Malone would do well, perhaps, to look into this wonderful *battel*, for some words, which, he supposed, did not exist, in 1603 :

“ Once

Thus, may we see a new example how
 “*doubting things go ill.*” This will, indeed,
 be always the fate of arguments, which are
 drawn from *negative* positions. This sort
 of probation, arising more from the scepticism of confidence, than from the doubts of knowledge, greatly abound in the enquiry under this head of the disquisition. The *Believer* will, in every argument, have the advantage of the *Sceptick*; because, he has only to prove his affirmative position, whilst his opponent is drivelling among his *doubts*, and dogmatizing with his *negatives*. Meanwhile, the Believer will often find light in darkness, and comfort in despair :

“ For, he embraceth much more earnestlie

“ The gainful *practice*, than cold *theorie* :

“ Nor, reckes he so of a sophisticke pride

“ Of prattling knowledge, too self magnifi’d.

“ Once happie in three Children born to me,

“ As *pretty wife* as ever man did see :

“ And now my third, my last beloved sonne,

“ But best beloved Sonne of all the three,

“ With whome my joyes do end, my life is done,

“ Most *deare* to his Queene-mother and to me.

§ V.

— § V. —

SHAKSPEARE'S PROFESSION OF FAITH.

THE Believers were induced by the principles of their logic, and were carried forward by their guide, Probability, to regard this profession of a pious Poet, as genuine; knowing it was a religious age, when such professions were commonly made. Against this document, indeed, the Enquirer professed to have "little to say;" (a) thinking, no doubt, with the constable, in Henry V:—

"A very little, little let us do;

"And all is done."——

After some *minute* Criticisms, which were probably intended to mean little, the Enquirer, supposing *himself* sure of the fact, laid his finger on an objection, which, he doubtless deemed of decisive moment: He was astonished to see the word *himself* exhibited as *one word* (b). He seems, from his objection, to have been unacquainted

(a) Apology 197.

(b) See the objection, and the answers, in The Apology, 202—3.

with

with Sylvester, a Contemporary of Shakspeare, who, in his age, had as much reputation, as our great Dramatist himself. Sylvester, who had a happy knack, at disjoining syllables, and tying words, would have instructed our Enquirer, how to connect, and separate, the word *selfe*. Here are some examples :

" Our-owne-selves Conquest is the most victorious :

" For in our selves ambush our greatest foes."

" All men are faultie : none a-live can say,

" I have not err'd; even the perfectest."

" 'Tis a most busie, yet a boot-les paine,

" To hide ones fault ; for doo the best thou can

" Thou can'st not hide it from thy *selfe* (though faine)

" For, who can hide him from *himselfe* (O man)!"

" More of thy *Selfe*, than others be asham'd ;

" Thy *Selfe* art most wrong'd by thine owne offence,

" And of thy *Selfe*, thy *selfe* first (selfy blam'd)

" Must give account to thy *selfes* Conscience. (c)"

We

(c) The Quadraints of Pibrac, Silvest. Transl. 710, 11, 12. In Wiclif's Translation of the New Testament, we may see *Yousilff*, for yourselves, in James III; and *Uffilf*, for ourselves, in Rom. viii; 1. Jon. 1; and in Hebrew,

We may behold, then, in these fine specimens, how Sylvester disjoined *Conjunctive* syllables, and grappled others, with *books of Steel*; such as those interesting words *our-owne-selves*, and *himselfe*.

Dissatisfied probably with his own assertion, our enquirer put the whole issue, with regard to this head of the question, on the non-existence of the word *accede*, for a century after the death of Shakspeare, in 1616: Yet, strange to tell! Diligence discovered its existence, at an earlier period, although confidence had missed it in later times. The truant, *accede*, was found in Florio's *New World of Words*, 1611(*d*). Nevertheless, cavil comes out in the guise of criticism, to assert, that the word *accede* did exist, in our language, before the death of Shakspeare, and has existed ever since, in Florio's *World of Words*; but, that it was

Ebrew, ch. 6, *hemself*, as one word. Such examples of what has been at once refute this objection, and deride the absurd practice of *negative arguments*, from the supposed nonentities of former times.

(*d*) See The Apology, 203, 16.

not

not in common use, nor likely to be introduced into Shakspeare's confession (*e*). Now, the issue was joined upon the existence, or non-existence of the word *accede*, during a century, after that epoch: The word was found to exist, at an earlier epoch: and, consequently, the issue was decided in favour of the finder. From that period to the present, Florio's dictionary has been in every hand; and the word *accede*, might have been, in every eye: And, therefore, to say, that it was not in *common use*, is a negative argument, more negative, if possible, than any in the negative catalogue, of such arguments in *the Enquiry*; because it arises from an assumption, which is absolutely against proof. Indeed, it is a consummation devoutly to be wished, that our professed critics, would constantly recollect, that—

“ To offend, and judge, are distinct offices;

“ And, of opposed natures.”

(*e*) *British Critic*, vol. ix. 519, 20.

§ VI.

THE MISCELLANIES.

BY coupling together things of such *opposed natures*; and, thereby, converting Criticism into Controversy, contests of every kind may be prolonged without end; because the combatants *must fight their battles o'er again; thrice to slay the slain.*

There cannot be finer examples of this remark, than the continued altercations about the name of Shakspeare: The fact, indeed, seems to be, that he did not write his name uniformly. He, certainly signed both his baptismal name and his surname differently, at different times: The former thus; W^m. Willm. and William (*f*); and the latter

(*f*) In that, and the preceding, Age, there was as little uniformity in the spelling of the baptismal names, as of the surnames: In Lord Orford's *Historic Doubts*, p. 118, there is a curious Letter of Richard 3d. about the marriage of the fair, but frail, wife of Shore: "Signifying unto you, that it is shewed unto us that
"our servaunt and solicitor, Thomas Lynom, mer-
"veillously blinded and abused with the late [wife] of
"Willm Shore." In Herbert's *Typ. ant.* vol. i. p. 543.
may

latter thus; Shakspeare, Shakspere, but for the last time, in his will, Shakspeare, (g).

However, may be seen *Wylm* Baldwyn; in p. 552, Williliam Baldwin, and *Willm* Baldwin; and in 392, Wylym, and William, Bonham. In the will of Augustine Phillips, our great Dramatist was called *Willm* Shakspeare. *These facts*, as they exhibit remarkable diversities, show, strikingly, how groundless was Mr. Malone's objection to the spelling of *Willm*. [Apology, 271.]

(g) As the Enquirer was unfounded in his objection to *Willm*, so is he equally unfounded, in his remarks on the Sirname of Shakspeare: For, it was written variously by himself, and by others. This observation is equally true, with regard to the principal poets of that age; as we may see in *England's Parnassus*, a Collection of Poetry, which was published, in 1600; Thus:

Sydney	—	Sidney	
Spenser	—	Spencer.	
Jonson	—	Johnson	— Jhonson.
Dekker	—	Dekkar.	
Markeham	—	Markham	
Sylvister	—	Sylvester	— Silvester.
Sackwill	—	Sackuil	
Fitz Geoffrey	—	Fitzjeffry	— Fitz Jeffrey
France	—	Fraunce.	
Midleton	—	Middleton.	
Gulpin	—	Gilpin.	
Achelly	—	Achely	— Achilly — Achillye.
		K	Drayton

However, one of the effects of contest is enquiry; and enquiry, producing certainty, ends in the establishment of truth.

The objections, which were made, on this head of the enquiry, to the existence of Arabic Numerals, in that age; to the reward for acting Plays; to the word *witty*; to the term upset (*h*); to the Blackfryers;

Drayton	—	Draston
Daniel	—	Daniell.
Davis	—	Davies.
Marlow	—	Marlowe.
Marston	—	Murston
Fairefax	—	Fairfax.
Kid	—	Kyd.

Yet; is it remarkable, that in this Collection of diversities, our Dramatist's name is uniformly spelt Shakespeare: In whatever manner this celebrated name may have been pronounced in Warwickshire, it certainly was spoken in London, with the *e*, soft, thus; Shakespeare: In the Registers of the Stationers' Company, it is written, Shakespere, and Shakespeare.

(*h*) In Chaloner's *Praise of Folie*, 1549, [sign. A. iii.] it is said that, "At *Folie's* becke onely, as oſtymes, ſo "now alſo, both holy and unholy things be torned *topſet-tirue*." In Bailey, *topſey-turvy* is ſaid to mean tops in turfs; *upſide down*.

to *fiſh*; to *view*; to *An. Dom.* as an unprecedented contraction; were all answered by the aſcertainment of facts (i). But, our Enquirer could not find *recompence* in the ſame ſenſe as *reward*: Had his diligence been equal to his ſecurity, he might have found *recompence*, in Sternhold and Hopkins, before Shakspeare began to appear, with his frequent mention of the ſame animating word:

“ His benefits they be ſo great,

“ To us, that be but ſin:

“ That, at our hands, for *recompence*,

“ There is no hope to win (k).”

Our enquirer objected, however, with a firmer tone, “ that at the beginning of the
“ laſt century, perſons of the firſt rank
“ were contented with *one Chriſtian* name;
“ that Henry, and Charles, the heirs ap-

(i) Apology, 229—40.

(k) Edit. Wolfe, 1591. p. 137. On the 26th of March, 1604, Sir Oliver St. John moved in the Houſe of Commons, “ the wants, and miſeries of the Iriſh
“ Servitors, in the late rebellion in Ireland: Their *re-*
“ *compence* was prevented by her Maſteſſie's death.
[Com. Journal. vol. i. p. 153.]

“ parent of the Crown, could boast of no
 “ such distinction, as the having of two
 “ Christian names (*l*).” Birch’s Life of
 Prince Henry, which contains the ceremonial
 of his baptism, ought to teach dogmatism to
 relinquish his usual positiveness, with respect
 to that Prince at least : But, of the assertion,
 with regard to Prince Charles, it may be
 said :

“ Forth irreturnable flies the spoken word,

“ Be it in scoffe, in earnest, or in bound.”

The fact, however, is, though history seems
 to be silent about it, that this Prince re-
 ceived the baptismal name of his father ;
 being baptized, on the 27th of December,
 1600, Charles-James, Duke of Rothsey,
 Earl of Ormond, &c. (*m*) : and, upon the
 demise of his father, he ascended the throne,
 by the name of Charles-James, which the

(*l*) Enquiry, 229.

(*m*) “ Hoc Anno *Carolus Jacobus* 19 Novem. 1600
 “ natus Fermiloduni.” [Simson’s MS *Annales Eccles.*
Scotorum :] The Abr. Chron. Edin. 1633, p. 154, says,
 that he was born, at Dumfermlin, and baptized, on
 the 27th of December, 1600, by the name of Charles
 James.

heralds

heralds were studious to proclaim. I have, moreover, shown, that two Christian names were not so rare, at the commencement of the last Century, as Camden, with his usual circumspection supposed: (n)

“ ——— Few words shall fit the trespass best,

“ Where no excuse can give the fault amending (o).”

From Kings the transition is easy to players, who sometimes represent royal

(n) I will here add, in support of Camden, and the truth, a few more examples of double names of baptism, in that age; Richard Maria Dunville, Esq. was born in 1603; Huntingdon Hastings Corney, Esq. was born about the same time; Anne Maria Estoutville; Eyston John Seymour; William Roberts Smith, A°. 1604; Edward Allen Tedder.

(o) Apology, 255. It is a curious fact, that there was buried, in the Church of Abergavenny, an. 1432, Sir John Atte Hene, Kt. [Hern's Robert of Gloster, vol. ii. p. 639.] Well; I will not leave this observation to stand for some Welch Reviewer to accuse me of ignorance, in not knowing, that *Hén*, which is pronounced *Hene*, in the Welch, signifies *Old*: And that *Hene* was added by a Welch Sculptor, in order to distinguish Old Sir John, from Young Sir John Atte: It is, however, a strong fact, that there was living, in 1659, at Winkfield in Berks, Henry Hene, Esq. who had in his Custody, the Monumental plate, of Sir John Atte Hehe, Kt. [Id.]

personages. In contradiction to Pope, who had said, that the players of Shakspeare's age were not gentlemen of the stage, but mere players, who were led into the buttery by the Steward, Mr. Malone, and Mr. Steevens, assert, "that there is no reason to suppose that Shakspeare, Burbage, *Lowin*, &c. who were licensed by King James, were treated in this manner (p)." In this passage, *Lowin* is made a player of consequence: In the Enquiry, Mr. Malone assures us, however, "That in 1608, *Lowin* was low, in his profession, and poor in his circumstances (q)." In the reverse of the picture, we now behold, that *Lowin*, being low, and poor, was only fit to be led into the buttery. "Is't good to sooth him in these *contraries*?" Having neither the voice, nor the heart, of flattery, I will only answer, that I do not feel it good to sooth the two commentators, when they state, "that *Lowin* was licensed by the

(p) Steevens's Shak. 1793, vol. i. p. 122.

(q) Enq. 253.

"patent

“ patent of King James ;” because, the record asserts, that neither the license, nor the will of Augustine Phillips, speaks of *Lowin*, as a fellow of Fletcher, and Shakspeare, Burbadge, and Phillips.

It is a *whimsical* circumstance, that the pride of accuracy should thus fall into error, after so long a search. Of the family of the *whimsicals*, Mr. Malone, with the help of Mr. Waldron, found, in the age of Shakspeare, only *Whim-Wham*, and *Whimsy* (r). I have in my travels, met with another of this fatherless family, called *Whim-len*, in Ben Jonson’s Masque of *Love Restored*: Robin Goodfellow cries out, “ Marry, before I could procure my properties, alarm came, that some of the “ *Whim-lens* had too much provisions (s).” Whether, amid so much uncertainty of ex-

(r) Enquiry, 206—7: In Johnson’s folio 1616; this is *Whimsy*: In Whalley, vol. ii. p. 328, it is *Whimsie*.

(s) Whalley, vol. v. 404. In the Enquiry, p. 207, Mr. Malone asserts “ that Volpone was first acted in “ 1607:” But, the folio of 1616 says 1605; and so does Whalley, vol. ii. p. 263.

istence, and derivation, it were a *whim*, or a whimsy, in our Enquirer to assert, that "*oune*, for one, is the spelling of no time "*whatsoever* (*t*)," I pretend not to know. One certainty, at least, is clear, that he seems never to have read that good old book, Wicliff's bible: "And thei hadden not "with 'hem but *oo* [one] loof [loaf] in the "boot [boat] (*u*)" In the translation by Erasmus, this passage, from Mark, Chap. VIII, may be read thus: "Neither had they "in the Shyp with them more then one "lofe (*x*)." Thus fruitless, are the searches after uniformity of spelling, in any age;

(*t*) Enq. 209.

(*u*) He who looks for the spellings of recorded time, may find in the same book: *aloone* for alone; *oon* for one; *anoon* for anon; *ony* for any; *oonlie* for only; In Wickliff's *Wicket* may be found *O* for one; and *ene* for one. In Bishop Pococke, 1450, may be seen [Effel. iv. 5.] "*Oon* is the Lord, *oon* feith, and *oon* baptism." [Lewis's Transl. of the New Testament, 68.] This mode of spelling one [*oon*] continued in good use till Henry 7th's time. [See his Instructions to his Ambassadors to Spain.]

(*x*) The New Testament printed by Redman 1538.

and

and thus futile, is the negative argument, for the establishment of truth, in any enquiry!

Amidst all this doubting, it was to be expected, that my law, relating to Deeds, Wills, and Testaments, should be called in question, as unprecise. However, my law was accurately stated, although it was ludicrously applied, for the purpose of laughing at *a little learning*. What I said on the authority of West, "that Codicils may be made, without any Testament, either precedent, or subsequent (y)," I still assert to be law, in opposition to the loose statement of Blackstone, in his Commentaries (z)." West is a better authority, upon the point, than Blackstone. I will only add what the Lord Chancellor Ellesmere repeated, from Justice Ascue, in the 37th of Henry VI: "Such a charter hath been allowed in the

(y) West's Symb. 1605, Lib. 2. § 649, § 633, § 639.

(z) 2 Black. Com. 500—1. In opposition to this, and in support of the ancient doctrine, See Bacon's Ab. in the excellent Edition of Mr. Gwillim, vol. vii. p. 328, 340.

" time

“time of our predecessors, which were as
“sage, and learned as we be (a).”

However true this observation of Ascue may have been, in the time of Henry VI. as to lawyers, it cannot be admitted as just, with regard to the commentators on Shakspeare. Mr. Pope, and Mr. Malone, accuse their predecessors, Heminges and Cundal, of ignorance; because they were not quite “as *sage*” as themselves; and allege, that not only their Latin, and French, but their very *Welsh*, are false (b). Whatever Mr. Malone, and Mr. Pope, may have found in Shakspeare, certain it is, that Heminges, and Cundal found no *Welsh* in his dramas; because there was none to find. There was indeed, much *Welsh* supposed to be said, and sung, at Glendower’s, in Henry IV; yet, was it all sung and said, aside. But the truth is, that though Shakspeare, with the help of such

(a) Lord Chancellor Ellesmere’s speech, in the Exchequer Chamber; touching the *post nati*. Printed for the Stationers, An. 1609.

(b) Enquiry, 271.

scholars as were at hand, could manage his *small Latin*, and little French, the Welch was a metal too unweildy for his anvil, as it has been found, for that of greater scholars, in subsequent times. Happy! if the commentators on Shakspeare had somewhat of his modesty: We should not then see so many assertions, without proof; and observations, without argument:

“To tire our patience, and mislead our sense.”

— § VII. —

THE LEARE AND HAMLETTE.

THREE words, it was said, will suffice, on this head of the Enquiry (a): Yet, was our patience tired, and our sense misled, by our minute Enquirer, who assumed, without proof, the very point, which he undertook to support, by argument.

One of the three words, which was to convict the *Leare* of spuriousness, was an objection to the use of *Liberty* in that age, for *license*. But, let us, passing by Shakspeare, look even to a prior time. In the

(a) Apology, 303.

controversy with Doctor Gabriel Harvey, the witty Nash makes use of the word *liberty*, in preference to *license*: "As touching the *libertie* of orators, and *poets*; I will conferre with thee somewhat gravely, although thou bee'st a goose cape, and ha'st no judgement: A *libertie*, thou sayst; but, no *liberty*, without bounds, no licence, without limitation: Jesu! what mister wonders dost thou tell us! Eevery thing hath an end, and a pudding hath two. That *libertie*, poets of late have used in their invectives, have exceeded, they have borne their sword up, where it is not lawful for a poynado, that is but the page of prowesse, to intermeddle." (b)

From this word, our Enquirer proceeds to a passage, which being nonsensical, fixes,

(b) "Strange Newes of the intercepting certaine Letters, and a Convoy of Verses, as they were going privilie to victual the Low Countries." By Thomas Nash, Gentleman, 1593. Such is the whimsical Title of Nashe's Confutation of Harvey's Foure Letters of the preceding *Yere*. [Sign. E.]

according

according to his logick, the forgery, beyond a controversy. The objection, then, is, that this death-giving passage is nonsense. And, he assumes, in opposition to the proofs of Warburton, that, in Shakspeare, there are no passages nonsensical, and feeble; and in contempt of Johnson, who says, that Shakspeare's set speeches are commonly cold and weak. Can there be any speech, colder, and weaker, than this of Kent's?

"I have a journey, Sir, shortly to go,

"My master calls, and I must not say no."

I certainly did think, and do maintain, that the supposititious passage of the surreptitious *Leare*, was more comprehensive, more energetic, and more Shaksperian than the genuine speech (c). On the other hand, our enquirer appears to have conceived of Shakspeare, as Donne expressed himself, on a different occasion:—

"——— His art did express

"A quintessence even from nothingness,

"From dull privations, and lean emptiness."

But, against the opinion of the Apologist, who still thinks that Shakspeare might be amended, if it were allowable, the anonymous critic aforesaid, shifting the question from one passage to another, produces only his *feelings*, and his taste (*d*). I will only reply in the words of a poet, who had both feeling, and taste:

“ There’s something previous ev’n to taste; ’tis *sense*.

But, what sense is there in giving the coldness, and weakness, of the genuine verses, in comparison with the energy and warmth of the spurious lines? Is emptiness, then, the characteristic of Shakspeare? Or, shall we regard amplification in the matter, and elaboration in the style, as more Shaksperian? Upon this reasoning, the Apologist preferred something to nothing: Upon a different principle, the anonymous critic prefers nothing to something; judging, no doubt, with Donne, that the very name of Shakspeare can extract *real quintessence*, from *lean emptiness*.

(*d*) British Critic, vol. ix. 521.

In criticism, we may judge of grammar, which has its rules, and of argument, which has its principles: But, who disputes, in spite of the old adage, about taste, which has neither rule, nor principle? Who, except the Critic aforesaid? He, departing from the point in issue, compares the *best* in Shakspeare, with the *worst* in his imitator. Whenever criticism assumes the province of controversy, absurdity of disquisition, and impertinence of remark, will too often be the illogical effects:

‘Now, Dulness smiling:—“Thus review the wits;

“But, murder *first*, and mince *them* all to bits:”

“And you, my Critic, in the chequer’d shade,

“Admire new light, thro’ holes, yourself hath made.

— § VIII. —

SHAKSPEARE’S NOTE OF HAND.

ON this head of the question, our Enquirer seems to have been actuated, by the congenial spirit of the anonymous Critic aforesaid: He first *murdered* the Believers in Shakspeare’s *Note of hand*, and *minced them*
into

into bits, afterwards:—No; by one great stroke of sceptical sophistry, the Enquirer dashed the Shaksperian document into non-existence. “Alas! it was a piteous deed!” What he undertook to prove a surreptitious bill, he declared to be “an evident forgery.” Such is the extent of his research, and the vigour of his reasoning, that a decisive argument he has always at hand:—

“—— His parts are so accomplisht,

“That, right, or wrong, he ne’er is nonplust.”

It was an adequate Apology for the Believers, that they produced similar documents, in the same age, by whatever denomination they were known, whether by that of bill, or note (a). The *fact* over ruled all reasoning

(a) Apology, 315. In addition to the notes of hand, and sealed Bills, which were therein stated, I will now lay before the reader some other specimens of similar documents, which I found on the Registers of the Stationers’ Company:—“29 June 1599, This day Mr. Bon. Norton hath promised to pay the XX^{li}, for not serving the underwardenship within one yere next: “And further, if his XX^{li} lent to her Majestie in this Court shall be repaid before the end of the said yere, “that

ing upon the point, either about the essence of it, or the Name. Neither did it answer

any

“that then, it shall go presently upon the receipt thereof
“to the satisfaction of the said fine, of XX^{li}.”

[Paid accordingly 29 Dec. 1599] By me Bonham Norton.

The same day, Mr. Man hath promised to pay the
ijj^{li}. vi^s. viij^d. set upon him within one yere next: And
further that yf his money iij^{li}. lent to her Majestie in
this Court shall be repaid within the end of the said
yere, that then he shall presently pay the said iij^{li}.
vi^s. viij^d.

Thomas Man.

The foregoing Specimens are conditional Notes of
hand. There are some other curious intimations, in the
Stationer's Registers, with regard to this subject. On
the 9th Aug. 1596, there was delivered in full court to
the Master and Wardens the Citie's *bill* under their
Seal for XL^{li}. lent in M^che last toward the Shippes.
Repayable 28th May 1597. That money after X in
the C. was provided.—It also appears, that this Sum,
which was made up to LXXX^{li}, was taken up at in-
terest and lent to the City for 4 months, according to
the precept.—This, then, is a specimen of a bill of
Debt, which was given by one Corporation to another.
We herein see, that the City borrowed money at 10 per
Cent. in order to lend it to Queen Elizabeth, to fit out
the Shippes: The Queen borrowed also very small Sums
of Money of the private members of the Stationer's
L Company.

any use to insist, that by law such documents could not be negotiated; as it was shown, that such notes were, in fact, transferable, by assignment, though they were not indorsable. It was probably supposed, that any argument would be decisive, in a case, which was likely to be carried through the Court of Criticism, without a hearing. But, the authentic *fact* is the great decider of causes!—

“ Afflicted sense, *thou* kindly dost set free,

“ Oppress’d with argumental tyranny.”

Indeed, afflicted sense finds a safe retreat, in the silence of the anonymous Critic aforesaid, upon the point. The fact, the law, the archaiology of *the bill*, the antiquity of paper

Company. These facts, as they are thus established by record evidence, exhibit a greater variety of such documents, than our Enquirer, from a narrow view of the Subject, would have us believe existed. It was asserted, that paper-credit, or borrowing, and lending on Government Securities, might be clearly traced to Elizabeth’s reign, if not to an earlier period. [Apology, 333.] It was said in the House of Commons, during the Session of 1605, that there were Privy-Seals, in the time of Henry 8th. [Com. Journ. vol. i. p. 289.]

money,

money, were so fixed, by unexpected proofs, that even hypercriticism could not find a little flaw. But, in the Enquiry, a great flaw was found by the Apologist; which, as it was overlooked by the Critic, shall be passed over by me, although the Enquirer endeavours to make *slight work* in regard to this *Note of Hand*, with the *Believers*, whom he proposes to punish, respectively, according to their degrees of guilt. But, guilt ought to be first proved, before punishment is proposed. And, he, who brings slight proofs to support strong accusations, will, generally, be cast into the ignoble class of those busy men, who are often found to accuse most loudly, when they can prove the least:

“ ——— of the truth herein,

“ This present object made probation.”

§ IX.

OF THE HISTORY OF THE STAGE.

THE annals of the Theatre, as they illustrate the manners of the times, and gratify the curiosity, which is natural to mankind, will, in every age, incite enquiry, and

enchain attention. The history of our stage has exercised the pens of Dr. Percy (*a*), of Mr. Thomas Warton (*b*), of Mr. Malone (*c*), and of other writers of diligence and learning. In addition to their curious researches, I too presumed to publish many documents (*d*), which a hasty search discovered among the state papers; and which, as they ascertain new facts, and throw some light upon the dark passages of our drama, during the age of Shakspeare, will enable the writer, to whom shall be assigned the difficult task of writing a compleat history of the stage, to instruct, by more ample notices, and to amuse, by more striking views of an attractive object.

After many revolutions in our public sports, both in representation, and sentiment, from *jufts to mysteries*; from *mysteries to moralities*; and from *moralities to interludes*;

(*a*) In his *Reliques of anc. Poetry*.

(*b*) In his *Hist. of English Poetry*.

(*c*) In his *Suppl. to the Edit. of Shak.* 1778, and in the *Prolog. to his Edit. of Shak.* 1790.

(*d*) *Apology*, 3 39.

the

the English stage remained extremely rude, at the accession of Elizabeth, and still unformed, at the appearance of Shakspeare. She inherited, indeed, the dramatic establishments of her predecessors; however imperfect they were in theory, and inconvenient in exhibition. She had, evidently, as a necessary officer, a keeper of the *vestures* of her *masks*, *revelles*, and *disguisings*: And, the earliest keeper of such *apparell*, from what I have been able to trace, was John Arnolde; who died, probably, in 1573. In the subsequent year, was appointed as his successor, her well beloved servant Walter Fythe, in consideration of good service, theretofore done to a grateful mistress (e).

A spe-

(e) I lay before the reader a Copy of this curious Commission from the unpublished papers of Rymer in the British Museum. [Asycough's Catalogue, No. 4625, p. 44.]

"29th Jan. De Concessione ad vitam pro Waltero Fythe. [Pat. 16, Eliz. p. 4. M 24.]

Elizabeth by the Grace of God &c. To all to whom &c. Greeting:

Wee lett you wytt that of our Grace espeeceyall cer-

A specimen of the *vestures*, which Walter Fyshe was thus appointed to keep, I have already

teyne knowledge and mere mocion and in consideration of the good and faythful service heretofore donne unto us by our welbeloved Servaunte Walter Fyshe we have given and graunted and by theis presentes for us our heires and successors doe gyve and graunte unto the said Walter Fyshe thoffice of Yoman or Keeper of our Vestures or apparell of all and singular our Maskes Ravelles and Disguysings and also of the apparell and trappers of all and singular our horses ordeyned and appoynted and hereafter to be ordeyned and appoynted for our Justes and Turneys and wee doe ordeyne constitute and make the same Walter Fyshe by theis presentes Yoman or keeper of our Vestures or Apparell of all and singular our Maskes Revelles and Disguysinges and also of the Apparell and Trappers of all and singular our horses ordeyned and appoynted or hereafter to be ordeyned and appoynted for our Justes and Turneys To have holde occupye and enjoye the said office to the said Walter Fyshe and his sufficiente Deputie or Deputies for terme of the lyffe naturall of the said Walter Fyshe with the waiges and fees of sixpence sterling by the daye for the overseing and saile kepeing of the same to be had and yerely perceaved of the Treasure of us our heires and successors at the receipte of th' exchequer of us our heires and Successors at Westminster by thandes of the Treasurer and Chamberlaynes

already exhibited to the curious beholder (f).

It was said by me, that our earliest actors were children : Children of St. Paul's, children of Westminster, children of the chapel (g). And it became, early, a common

berlaynes of Us our heires and Successors ther for the tyme being at the feastes of th' annunciacion of Our Lady and Saynt Michael th' archaungell by evin portions and further we give unto the said Walter Fyshe yerely during his said lyffe one liverye coate such as Yeoman Officers of our household have of us to be yerely had and perceaved at our greate Wardrobe by the handes of the keeper or Clerke of the same for the tyme beinge and to have and enjoye one sufficiente house or mancion to be assigned unto the said Walter Fyshe for the sure better and safe keping of our said Vestures Apparell and Trappers togeather with all manner commodities and advantages to the said Office to be dewe and accustomed or in any wise apperteyning in as large ample and benefyciall manner and forme as John Arnolde deceased or any other or others Yeomen keepers of all and singuler the premisses above mencyoned have had and enjoyed or of right ought to have and enjoye the same albeit expresse mencyon &c.—Teste Regina, apud Westm. XXIX. Januarij.

[Per breve de privato Sigillo.]”

(f) Apology, 354.

(g) Apology, 359.

practice to purvey boys, who had musical voices, for the Royal Chapel. Tuffer, who wrote *The five hundred points of good husbandry*, appears to have been thus taken, and appropriated, during the reign of Henry VIII. (b) :

“ Thence, for my voice, I must (no choice)

“ Away of force, like posting horse,

“ For sundry men, had placards then,

“ Such Child to take.”

The right, and the practice, of purveying such children, continued until the reign of James, although I know not on what principle it was justified ; except by the maxim, that the King had a right to the services of all his subjects. Sir Francis Bacon, speaking in the House of Commons, upon the grievance of purveyance, on the 7th of

(h) His own Life, in verse, p. 141, of his book, entitled *Five hundred points of Good Husbandry*. Tuffer was carried by “ friendship’s lot” to St. Paul’s, where he learned music under John Redford, an excellent musician. [Id.] The celebrated Erasmus was a *Child of the Choir* in the Cathedral of Utrecht, till he was nine years of age: He was born, in 1467, and died in 1536.

March

March 1605-6, said, "that children for
"the chapel may be taken (i)." It was,
probably, from this abundant source, that
some of the earliest, and best, of our players
originated, who derived a livelihood, and
rose often to eminence, by amusing the pub-
lic.

It is more than probable, that James
Burbadge, who appeared at the head of the
first incorporated company of players in 1574,
may have been purveyed, like Tuffer, in
early life, and may have forgotten his ap-
rentage. Certain it is, that during the he-
raldic visitation of London, in 1634, Cuth-
bert Burbadge, the eldest son of James, did
not know his grandfather; for he could only
give an account of his brother Richard,
"the famous actor on the stage," and of his
father James, who married Ellen, the daugh-

(i) Com. Jour. vol. i. 279. The fact is, that, as late
as the accession of Charles, the 1st, drummers were
pressed for the army; as we may clearly see, in the
Privy Council Registers.

154 A SUPPLEMENTAL APOLOGY [OF THE HISTORY
ter of Mr. Brayne, of London (*k*). What-
ever may have been their originals, there
can

(*k*) For a pedigree of the Burbadges, I owe a kindness to Francis Townsend, the Windsor Herald, who was so good as to inform me, that the same Arms were allowed to Cuthbert, in 1634, as belonged to a very numerous family of Burbadges in Hertfordshire; a circumstance, from which a connection of family is inferred. Cuthbert sometimes spelt his name *Burbage*, as did the *Burbages*, of Herts. Mr. Malone spells the name *Burbadge*: "But, the name ought rather, he adds, "to be written *Burbidge*, being manifestly a corruption "of *Boroughbridge*." [Shak. 1790, vol. i. p. 2. p. 184.] The Arms, however, of the Burbadges were three *Bears* heads; and their Crest was a *Boar's* head: The heraldic conceit of the Arms was plainly derived from the early notion, that the original name was *Boar-bage*. We thus, perceive, that whatever name of that age we attempt to investigate, no uniformity of Spelling can be found. We have always had *badge*, and *badger* in our language, but not *bage*, I believe. It was said, that *Helen* Burbadge, widow, who was buried on the 8th of May, 1613, was probably the relict of James Burbadge. [Apology, 386.] We now see, distinctly, that he did marry *Ellen* Brayne of London. Their daughter Alice, who was baptized, on the 11th of March 1576, and married one Walker, had a legacy from Nicholas Tooley of ten pounds by the name of "Alice Walker, the

can be no doubt, that the several Burbadges performed, respectably, on that "Stage," "where every one must play a part;" and where, many individuals play "a sad one."

A similar doubt has also existed, with regard to the origin of Edward Alleyn, though the biographers, indeed, assure us, "that he was born of reputable parents, who lived in good fashion and credit(1)." Yet, are we still left, by biographical indolence, to enquire, who were the father, and mother, of that celebrated comedian, and beneficent man. The record of *the fact* is, however, to be found in the College of Heralds. His grandfather was Thomas Alleyn of Willen,

the sister of my late Master Burbadge "deceased." In the same will, there is a legacy of ten pounds to Elizabeth Burbadge, alias *Maxey*: Now, it appears by the pedigree, which her father gave in to the College of Heralds, that she married for her first husband Amias Maxey, Gentleman, by whom she had James Burbadge Maxey, who was adopted, by her father: for her second husband, she married George Bingley, one of the Auditors to King Charles the 1st.

(1) Kippis's Biog. Brit. vol. i. p. 150.

in

in the County of Bucks, and of Mesham, in the County of Bedford: His father was Edward Alleyn, of Willen aforesaid: and his mother, Margaret, was the daughter of John Townley, of Townley, in the County of Lancashire, of a respectable family, which, to this day, “ lives in good fashion and “ credit.” Edward Alleyn was born on the 1st of September, 1566, and was baptized, as I found by searching the parish register of St. Botolph, without Bishopgate, on the 2d of the same month: Nor, can it now be any longer, reasonably, doubted, whether London be entitled to the honour of his birth. Though a younger man than Shakespeare, Alleyn was sooner praised by wits, and distinguished by the world. In the *Pierce Pennyleffe* of Nash, which was first printed, in 1592, may be seen “ the *due commendation of Ned Allen*:” “ Not Rofcius,” says Nash, “ or Æsop, those admired tragedians, that have lived ever “ since before Christ was born, could ever “ perform more in action, than famous “ Ned Allen.” Nash went on to add, in
the

the same strain of encomium, what arose from his enthusiastic admiration: "If ever
 " I write any thing in *Latin*, (as I hope
 " one day I shall,) not a man of any desert
 " here among us, (the players particularly)
 " but I will have up; Tarleton, Ned Allen,
 " Knell, Bently, shall be known in France,
 " Spain, and Italy; and not a part that they
 " surmounted in more than other, but I will
 " there note, and set down, with the manner
 " of their habits and attire (*m*).". In the
 silence of Nash, we may perceive, that
 neither Shakspeare, nor Richard Burbadge,
 had distinguished themselves, as players, in

(*m*) In the opinion of Ben Jonson, who, with all his prejudices, must be allowed to have been a competent judge, Ned Alleyn was the greatest actor, that had then appeared; or that would appear, according to Sir Richard Baker: Ben Jonson, who always supposed that his pen conferred immortality, addressed his 89th Epigram to Edward Allen:

"And present worth in all dost so contract,

"As others *speake*, but only thou dost *act*;

"Wear this renowne: 'Tis just, that who did give

"So many Poets life, by *one should live*!

1592, when Shakspeare, indeed, had but just appeared, as a dramatic writer (*n*). It is a memorable circumstance, which ought to be strongly marked, by the historian of our Stage, that such great actors should have existed, to whom Shakspeare, at length, supplied dramas, which were fully equal to their powers of performance: And it will be found, perhaps, that the dramatist derived an advantage from the player, and the player a benefit from the dramatist. Among the players, as Alleyn was the first, so he appears to have been the most distinguished; and is even supposed, though not upon the most satisfactory evidence, to have furnished Shakspeare, by his just representation of characters, with some intimations of the celebrated precepts, which were given to the

(*n*) In fact, it does appear, that Richard Burbadge had come out on the Stage, as early as 1589, but in the inconsiderable part of a *Messenger*. [Steev. vol. i. 506—7.] There is reason to suspect, that Shakspeare himself appeared as early, on the same stage, in as trivial a Character. [Ib. 495.]

actors

actors by Hamlet. (o). When such doubts arise, from the difficulty of ascertaining facts of so remote a period, with regard to the

(o) In the Apology, p. 391, it was said, on the authority of Mr. Malone, chiefly, that Edward Alleyn married Joan Woodward, the Daughter of Henslow's wife. It appears, however, from the funeral Certificate of this Lady, in the College of Arms, by John Gifford, the Senior Fellow, and preacher, of the College, and John Symon, the Schoolmaster thereof, and a Fellow, "that she was the Daughter, of the Worshipful "Phillip Henslowe, Esquier, one of the Sewers of his "Majestie's Chamber." On that occasion, the Arms of Henslow were impaled with the Arms of her husband. When Alleyn entered his pedigree at the visitation of the County of Surrey, in 1623, he gave exactly the same account of his wife. In a doubtful point, whether her name were Woodward, or Henslow, the inference of the Heralds, from the impaling of the arms, ought to be decisive, that the wife of Alleyn was a Henslow, and not a Woodward: Yet, it appears by the written declaration of Henslow himself, that Edward Alleyn did marry Joan Woodward: [Mal. Shak. 1 vol. p. 288.] Thus difficult is it to ascertain a fact, even from satisfactory evidence; though the Commentators, and Critics, demand *demonstration*, as the only proof, in the affairs of common life! In the pedigree of Edward Alleyn, he is called "Master of His Majesty's Game of "Bulls and Bears, and Mastif dogs."

principal

principal players, we ought not to be surpris'd, that still greater doubts should exist, with respect to the inferior actors of Shakspeare's dramas, especially as we are without the same means of giving light to darkness.

GEORGE BRYAN, who, like greater men, will only be remembered from his connection with Shakspeare, appeared, as early as 1589, in Tarleton's *Plat of the Seven Deadly Sins*: he represented Lucius, in Gorboduck; he played the Earl of Warwick, in Henry the sixth, during 1592; he performed some of the characters in Shakspeare's earliest plays; but he did not live long enough to represent any part in Ben. Jonson's *Every Man in his Humour*, during 1598: George Bryan was certainly dead, at this epoch; though I have not been able to discover either the time, or place, of his burial; or any record of his will.

SAMUEL GROSSE had the honour, certainly, to embody some of Shakspeare's fictions; and is celebrated, by Heywood, together

gether with Knell (*p*), Bently, Mills, Wilson (*q*), and Lanam, as players, who “by
 “ the report of many judicial auditors per-
 “ formed many parts so absolute, that it
 “ were a sin to drowne their worths in
 “ Lethe (*r*).” Crosse died, probably, before the year 1596; though I have not been able to find when, or where; nor, to discover his will; nor any administration to his Estate, if indeed he left any behind him.

THOMAS POPE played his part, as early as 1589, in Tarleton's *Platt of the Seven*

(*p*) It appears by the parish register of St. Mary Aldermanbury, that a William Knell was buried in the Cemetery of that parish, on the 24th of September, 1578; that a William Knell married Rebecca Edwards, on the 30th January, 1585-6; that John Hemming married Rebecca Knell, widow, on the 10th of March, 1587-8: From these entries we may conclude, that Knell, one of the great actors of that period, is the person, to whom they relate.

(*q*) Robert Wilson was one of the Earl of Leicester's Servants, to whom the theatrical License was granted, in 1574. A Robert Wilson made his Will on the 29th January, 1576-7, which was proved on the 1st of February of the same year.

(*r*) Heywood's Apology.

M

Deadly

Deadly Sins; he represented Arbactus, in *Sardanapalus*; he was, in 1597, and 1598, at the head of the Lord Chamberlayne's Servants, together with Hemings, who had the honour of being the first who represented Shakspeare's characters. Pope lived respectably in St. Saviour's parish, Southwark; and rose to such eminence, as a fellow of Shakspeare, as to have equally had a share in the Globe, and Curtain, Theatres; and to have employed under him theatrical servants. He died in February 1603-4; leaving considerable property to those, whom he most regarded (s). Of Gabriel Singer, Pope, Phillips,

(s) I here subjoin a Copy of the Will of Pope, "Extracted from the Registry of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury;" as it contains some theatrical particulars, which the curious reader may wish to see; and as it exhibits Pope in a higher station, than he has hitherto been supposed to have held:—

"In the Name of God Amen the two and twenty of July in the year of our Lord God one thousand six hundred and three and the first year of the Reign of our Sovereign Lord King James. I Thomas Pope of the parish of St. Saviour's Southwark in the County of Surry Gentleman being at this present in good and perfect

Phillips, and Slye, it was remarked, by Heywood, in 1612, " that though they be
 " dead,

best health laude and praise be given to the Almighty God therefore do make ordain and declare this my pnt Testament and last Will in manner and form following that is to say First and principally I commend my Soul into the hands of Almighty God my Maker Saviour and Redeemer hoping and assuredly believing to be saved through the merits death and passion of my Saviour Jesus Christ and to enjoy eternal blessedness in the Kingdom of Heaven And my body I commit to the earth to be buried in Xtian burial in the church called St. Saviours where I now dwell And I give towards the setting up of some monument on me in the said Church and my Funeral Twenty pounds Item I give and bequeath to the poor of the Liberty where now I dwell thre pounds Item I give and bequeath unto Suzan Gasquine whom I have brought up ever since she was born the sum of one hundred pounds of lawful money of England and all my Household Stuff my Plate only excepted Item I will that the said Suzan Gasquine shall have the use and occupation of all that House or Tenement wherein I now dwell in the parish of St. Saviours aforesaid during her natural life if the Lease and Term of years which I have in the same shall so long continue and endure so as the said Suzan or her Assigns do pay the one half of the Rent reserved by the lease to me thereof from time to time and at

“ dead, their deserts yet live in the remem-
 “ brance of many.”

ROBERT

such time as is limited in and by the same Lease amongst others made by Francis Langley Drax deceased and do also perform such Covenants touching the said Tenement as are to be done by force of the said Lease and if the said Suzan shall happen to die before the expiration of the said Term then I will that my Brother John Pope shall have the use and occupation of the said Tenement during the residue which at the time of the decease of the said Suzan shall be to come and unexpired of the said Term he doing for the same and paying from thenceforth as the said Suzan should or ought to have done if she had lived to the full end of the said Term Item I will and bequeath unto my Brother John Pope the Tenement adjoining to the east side of my said dwelling house wherein John Moden now dwelleth and during all such Term of years as I have to come and unexpired of and in the same by virtue of the Lease aforesaid so as the said John Pope and his Assigns during the continuance of the said Term do pay them half of the rent reserved by the said Lease from time to time and at such days and times as is limited by the same Lease and do perform such Covenants touching only the said Tenement to him my said Brother bequeathed as are to be done by force of the said Lease and also that my said Brother do within one month next after my decease enter into Bond of a reasonable

ROBERT GOUGH, who had the honour
of representing parts, in the Tragedyes, Co-
medyes,

sonable sum of money to my Executors for payment of the said moiety or one half of the said Rent and performance of the Covenants touching the same Tenement as aforesaid according to my true meaning and intent in that behalf Item I will and devise unto Mary Clarke alias Wood all that Tenement adjoining to the west side of my said dwelling house wherein John Holland now dwelleth for and during the continuance of the Term of years which I have in the same (amongst others as aforesaid) by force or virtue of the said Lease to me made by the said Francis Langley to be by her holden and enjoyed from time to time free of any Rent to be paid for the same so long as she lives and after her decease I give and bequeath my Interest and Term of years then to come and unexpired of and in the said Tenement unto Thomas Bromley who was heretofore baptized in the parish of St. Andrew's Undershaf in London Item I give and bequeath to the said Marie Clark alias Wood and to the said Thomas Bromley as well all my part right title and interest which I have or ought to have of in and to all that Playhouse with the Appurts called the Curtein situated and being in Hallywell in the parish of St. Leonard's in Shoreditch in the County of Middlesex as also all my part Estate and Interest which I

medyes, and Histories, of Shakspeare, was, probably, bred by Thomas Pope. Goughe appeared,

have or ought to have of in and to all that Playhouse with the Appurts called the Globe in the parish of St. Saviours in the County of Surry Item I give and bequeath to the said Thomas Bromley the sum of Fifty pounds and my Chayne of Gold being in value Thirty pounds and Ten shillings to be paid and delivered unto him at such time as he shall have accomplished his full age of one and twenty years provided in the mean time his Mother shall receive these Legacies in regard the use thereof may bring up the Boy putting in good security for delivering in the aforesaid Legacies at his full years of one and twenty and if the said Thomas shall happen to die and depart this mortal life before he shall have accomplished his said age of one and twenty years then I will give and bequeath the said sum of Fifty pounds and the said Cheyne of Gold unto the said Marie Clarke alias Wood to her own use Item I give and bequeath to the said Marie Clarke alias Wood the sum of Fifty pounds more provided always and my Will and Mind is that if the said Marie shall happen to die and depart this mortal life before the said Thomas Bromley then the said Fifty pounds shall remain to the said Thomas Bromley to be paid to him at such time as he shall accomplish the full age of one and twenty years Item I give and bequeath

appeared, with his master, in *Sardanapalus*, in the character of *Aspasia*; he had a legacy from

queath to Agnes Web my Mother the sum of Twenty pounds of lawful money of England and to my Brother John Pope the sum of Twenty pounds and to my Brother William Pope other Twenty Pounds. Item I give and bequeath to the Children of my said Bretheren of John and William Pope the sum of Ten pounds to be paid and distributed equal amongst the same Children part and part alike. Item I give and bequeath to Robert Gough and John Edmans all my wearing apparel and all my arms, to be equally divided between them. Item I give and bequeath to my Cousin Thomas Owen Five pounds. Item I give and bequeath to my loving Friend John Jackson one Ring with a square Diamond in it. Item I give and bequeath to Marie Clarke alias Woode half my plate and to Suzan Gasquine the other half being equally divided between them. Item I give and bequeath to Dorothe Clark Sister to Marie Clarke alias Wood one Gold Ring with five opalls in it. All the rest of my Rings I give to good Wife Willingson who is now the keeper of my house. Item I give and bequeath unto my loving friend Bazell Nicholl Scrivenor the sum of Five pounds and to my neighbour and friend John Wrench the sum of Five pounds the residue of all my Goods Rights and Chattels not before bequeathed my Debts and Funeral

from Pope, in 1603, of the testator's *wearing* apparel, and *arms*; he played in the *Second* *Mayden's Tragedy*, during the year 1611; But, he disappeared, soon afterwards, so as not to be traced, either in the play bills, or at Doctor's Commons. The Puritans, who regarded plays, and actors, with a very evil eye, considered "players, as an abomination, that put on women's raiment."⁽¹⁾

charge being first satisfied I wholie give and bequeath to my Mother my Brothers and their Children to be equally divided between them And I do ordain and appoint my well beloved Friends Bazell Nicholl and John Wrench to be the Executors of this my last Will and Testament earnestly praying and desiring them to see the same performed in all things according to my true meaning therein And for because much of this Money is out upon Bonds I do limit for the performance of this my Will six Months And thus not doubting but they will perform the trust in this behalf by me in them reposed In Witness whereof I have set my hand and seal.

(Signed) Thomas Pope."

Sealed in the presence of—John Wrench

John Edmans

(1) The Overthrow of Stage plays, 1599, without the name of the publisher, or the place; Sign. C. iii.

Whether

Whether Goughe, and his *fellows*, who, generally, represented women, were much affected by this reproach, it is not easy to discover, amid the disputes, about the lawfulness of the theatres. It seems to have been forgotten by the Puritans, in their zeal, that if recreation be necessary to mankind, rational amusement may be justified, as fit, from the necessity.

SAMUEL GILBORNE, who also had the honour of representing some of the inconsiderable characters of our great dramatist, served his apprenticeship with Augustine Phillips, one of the fellows of Shakspeare. When Phillips made his will, in 1605, he bequeathed to Gilborne, "his *late apprentice*, the some of fortye shillings, his "mouse coloured velvet hose, and a white "taffety dublet, a black taffety sute, his "purple cloke, sword, and dagger, and his "base violl." Other notices about Gilborne, who probably lived, and died, in obscurity, I have not been able to find, either in the play bills, or in the Prerogative Office.

WILLIAM

WILLIAM OSTLER, from the obscurity of his origin, may be supposed to have been purveyed, like Tuffer, in early life, as a singing boy. Certain it is, that as one of the children of Queen Elizabeth's Chapel, he represented one of Ben Jonson's Characters in *The Poetaster*, during the year 1601. When he ceased to be a child, Ostler played in Jonson's *Alchymist*, in 1610; in *Catiline*, during the year 1611; and in the *Dutchess of Malfy* of Webster, in 1623. In Davis, the Epigrammatist's *Scourge of Folly*, Ostler is praised as the *Roscius* of the times: But, so many of the players were addressed by our Poets, by the name of the great player of the Roman state, that we may reasonably suppose, they did not very nicely discriminate, when their desire to praise was scattering, with a lavish pen, their *encomiums*, which cease to be praise, if generally applied.

NATHANIEL FIELD was also one of the children of the chapel, and one of the performers of Shakspeare's characters. In Ben Jonson's *Comical Satyre*, called *Cynthia's Revells*,

Revells, which was acted by the Queen's Children of the Chapel, in 1600, Field played a principal part. In the subsequent year; he acted as one of the chief comedians, in Jonson's *Poetaster*. When he left the Chapel, he became, after the accession of King James, one of the company called *the Children of Her Majesty's Revells*. In 1607, he acted the part of *Bussy D'Ambois*, in Chapman's Drama, and he performed, in 1609, one of the first characters in Ben Jonson's *Silent Woman*. Whether Field were a writer, as well as an actor, of plays, has admitted of some doubt: Roberts, the player, who, smartly, animadverted on Pope's preface, spoke affirmatively, on the point; the intelligent writer of the *Biographia Dramatica* speaks, negatively; giving the disputable Dramas, to Nathaniel Field, of New College, Oxford. But, a begging letter of Field, the player, which was preserved by Ned Alleyn, among Henslowe's papers, and published by Mr. Malone, has decided the contest, in the actor's favour: For, the letter proves, that Field asked, and
received,

received, money from the liberality of honest Henslowe, for *play writing* (u). Field, the player, published, in 1602, a comedie, called, "*A Woman is a Weathercock*;" in 1618, another comedie, entitled, "*Amends for Ladies*;" and, in 1632, "*The Fata Dowry*," which he wrote in co-operation, with Massinger (x), who, being equally poor, and equally engaged in writing, when confined in *durance* with Field, joined with him, in begging the help of Henslowe. The facts before stated decide, in opposition to the Commentators, that Field, the player, was the writer of the dramas. He died before the year 1641, though I have not been able to discover either his will, or the date of his burial. It is a remark of Anthony Wood, which applies pertinently to Field, the poet-player; "So it is, and always has been, that poets live poor, and die in obscuritie."

JOHN UNDERWOOD appears to have held nearly the same course, through life, as

(u) Mal. Shak. p. 2. of vol. i. p. 324.

(x) Biog. Dram. i. v. 159.

Nathaniel Field. Underwood was also one of the Children of the Chapel; He performed in *Cynthia's Revels*, during the year 1600; in the *Poetaster*, during 1601; with the King's Servants, he played in the *Alchymist*, in 1610, and in *Catiline*, in 1611: and he represented *Delio*, in *The Dutchess of Malfy*, in 1623. In this year, when Nicolas Tooley made his will, he kindly forgave Underwood the several sums of money, which were due by him to the testator. Underwood had the honour to be one of the performers of Shakspeare's characters, and enjoyed the benefit of being a fellow sharer in the Globe, Blackfriars, and Curtain, Theatres. He died, in January 1624-5; leaving five children, who had before lost their mother; and now, had only their father's "kind fellows, his Majesties Servants" to protect their infant weakness.

WILLIAM ECCLESTONE was also one of the King's Servants, and equally represented with them Shakspeare's characters at the Globe, and at their usual house, in the Blackfriars. He played in the *Alchymist*,
during

during 1610, and, during the subsequent year, in *Catiline*. Nicolas Tooley, with his usual benevolence, forgave Ecclestone, in 1623, all the debts, which were due to him. He disappeared, before the 6th of May, 1629, at which time he was no longer one of the King's players; but, I have not been able to find his will in the registers, either of the Bishop of London, or of the Archbishop of Canterbury. He, who acts an insignificant part, on the stage of life, cannot hope to be long remembered, while so many men of greater eminence are daily disappearing from the public eye.

JOSEPH TAYLOR is said by tradition, which is not supported by circumstances, to have played Hamlet, and Iago, when these characters were first represented; to have performed *True Wit*, in the *Silent Woman*, and *Face*, in the *Alchymist*; though this assertion is not confirmed by Ben Jonson himself. The player-editors ranked Joseph Taylor, however, among those, who had the honour to represent Shakspeare's characters. He is said to have been at the head of
the

the Lady Elizabeth's players, in 1614. Whatever parts he may have acted, before the year 1623, he was still poor, and low: When the kind-hearted Nicolas Tooley, in that year, made his will, he directed that, "Whereas I stand bound for Joseph Taylor, "as his surety, for payment of ten pounds, "or thereabouts, my Will is, that my Executors, shall out of my estate pay that debt for him, and discharge him out of that bond." It is remarkable, that Tooley does not call Taylor, a fellow. Certain it is, however, that he was enumerated among the King's Players, on the 6th of May, 1629, next to Hemmings, and Lowin. In this year, he performed the part of *Paris*, the tragedian, in Massinger's *Roman Actor*, at the private Playhouse, in the Blackfriars, with the King's Servants. Among other wits, Taylor prefixed some encomiastic verses, "to his long known, and loved friend, Mr. Philip Massinger, upon his *Roman Actor*:"

"—— But, why I write to thee,

"Is to profess our loves Antiquitie,

"Which

"Which to this Tragedie must give my test ;

"Thou hast made many good, but this thy best."

In 1629, Taylor played the *Duke*, in Carlell's *Deserving Favourite*: In 1630, he represented *Matbias*, a Knight of Bohemia, in Maffinger's *Picture*, "a true Hungarian History." From this epoch, during many years, Joseph Taylor acted, a conspicuous part, as one of the chiefs of the King's Company, with Lowin, and Swanston. In September 1639, he was appointed the Yeoman of the Revels, under Sir Henry Herbert, who found him an intelligent assistant. Taylor was one of the ten players, who, in dedicating Beaumont and Fletcher's *Comedies and Tragedies* to the Earl of Pembroke, in 1647, spoke with feeling recollection of "the flowing compositions of the then expired sweet swan of Avon, *Shakespeare*." Taylor died, in 1654, at a very advanced age, indeed, if he represented Hamlet, in 1596.

ROBERT BENFIELD appears to have come late into the King's Company, and to have represented, originally, but few of *Shakespeare's*

speare's characters. He appeared, distinctly, among the King's Players on the 6th of May, 1629. He bustled through several parts of no great difficulty; but he seems to have never risen above the general level of the "Harlotry players." He lived to be one of the ten comedians, who, in 1647, dedicated to Philip, the Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, Beaumont and Fletcher's *Comedies and Tragedies*; but I have not found any memorial of his last Will, or of his final End.

RICHARD ROBINSON came early enough into life, and into action, to represent Shakespeare's characters, in the same scenes, with Hemings, and Burbadge. In 1611, he acted with them, and the King's other players, in Ben Johnson's *Catiline*. Even as late as 1616, he represented female characters, long after the Puritans had exhausted their malignity, in thundering out anathemas against such supposed profanations. In 1623, when Nicolas Tooley was disposing of his property by will, he gave, "to Sara Burbadge, the daughter of his late Master, Richard Bur-

N

" badge,

“ badge, that some of twenty nine pounds,
 “ and thirteen shillings, which was owing
 “ to him by Richard Robinson.” He ap-
 peared in the fourth place among the King’s
 players, on the 6th of May, 1624. He
 joined with the nine other players, in the
 dedication of Beaumont and Fletcher’s plays,
 in 1647. There is a story told by Mr. Ma-
 lone, which is repeated by Mr. Steevens,
 that General Harrison killed Robinson, dur-
 ing the civil wars; the general crying out
 with a fanatical tongue, when he gave the
 stroke of death; “ cursed is he that doth
 “ the work of the Lord negligently(y).” But
 the fact is, which is more credible than the
 story, that Richard Robinson died, quietly,
 at London, in March, 1647, and was buried,
 without an Anathema, in the cemetery of St.
 Anne’s, Blackfriars (z).

JOHN SCHANKE was a comedian of an

(y) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 366.

(z) The Parish Register, expressly, records, that
 Richard Robinson, a *Player*, was buried, on the 23d of
 March, 1646-7: So that there can be no doubt about
 the identity of the person.

inferior

inferior cast though he is ranked among those players, who had the honour of representing Shakspeare's characters. He acted the *Curate* in Beaumont and Fletcher's *Scornful Lady*, during the year 1616. Schanke was a writer, as well as an actor: And produced a comedy, called *Schanke's Ordinary*, in March, 1623-4 (a). He stood the fifth, in the list of the King's Players, in May, 1629. He was also one of Prince Henry's Company. But, he died, probably, before the year 1647; though I have not been able to discover the time, or place, of his death, or the will of this poetical player, who like other poets, had little to leave behind him, to his fellows, or relations.

JOHN RICE has still less pretensions to fame, though he, too, performed some of Shakspeare's characters. He acted the part of *Pescara*, in the *Dutchess of Malfy*, during the year, 1623. He probably died

(a) The license for this play, stands thus, in Sir Henry Herbert's Register: "For the King's Company; "Shanke's Ordinary, written by Shankes himself, this "16th March, 1623."

before the year 1629; as he does not appear in the List of the King's Players, at that epoch; yet, have I not found the date of his decease, nor the record of his testament.

JOHN LOWIN, who was probably born in 1576, seems first to have appeared upon the Stage in Ben Jonson's *Sejanus*, with Burbadge, and Shakspeare, in 1603, after the accession of King James. In the subsequent year, he came out with Burbadge, and Slye, in *the Induction* to Webster and Marston's *Malcontent*. The traditions, which have been handed down by Wright, and Roberts, about Lowin's representations of Falstaff, Hamlet, and Henry VIII. cannot be true, if applied to any preceding period to the accession of Charles I. More experienced Actors performed Shakspeare's characters, when they were first presented to the public. He certainly played in the *Fox* of Jonson, in 1605, in the *Alcbymist*, during 1610, and in *Catiline*, during 1611. He stood the second in the enumeration of the King's players in the List of 1629, after Hemings, and before Taylor. In the sarcastic

castic verses, which were addressed to Ben Johnson, in consequence of his insolent treatment of the public, it is said :—

“ Let Lowin cease, and Taylor scorn to touch

“ The loathed stage ; for *thou* hast made it such.”

These two players certainly became the chiefs of the King's Company, after the secession of Condel, and Hemmings, about the year 1627. In December, 1624, this whole company, with Lowin, and Taylor, at their head, were obliged to make a submission to Sir Henry Herbert, for acting the play, called *The Spanishe Viceroy*, without his licence, as Master of the Revels. At a subsequent period, Lowin and Swanson were obliged to ask Sir Henry's pardon, “ for their ill manners.” In 1647, Lowin, and Taylor, stood at the head of the ten player-editors of Beaumont and Fletcher's dramatical folio. In 1652, these two concurred in publishing, as a trifling resource, during the miseries of the grand rebellion, *The wild goose chase* of Fletcher. During a very advanced age, Lowin, for a livelihood, kept an inn, at Brentford, called

The Three Pigeons. And, he finished his lengthened career of life, being buried in the cemetery of St. Martin's in the Fields, on the 18th of March, 1658-9, when administration to his goods was granted to Martha Lowin, who was probably either his widow, or his daughter. (*b*)

Such were the players, who, in conjunction with those more celebrated persons, whom I formerly mentioned (*c*), were the actors, that represented Shakspeare's characters, either when his dramas first appeared, or when the original players had retired from the scene. It was little foreseen, by any of them, that Shakspeare's name would emblazon theirs; that their fame would be carried along the oblivious stream of time, borne up by his strength, and eternized by the immortality of his renown.

It must be allowed, however, that both the actors, and the dramatists, owed great obligations to the Privy Council, and to

(*b*) Mal. Shak. vol. i. p. 2. p. 205-8.

(*c*) Apology, 422 to 461.

Parliament,

Parliament, for their several regulations of the scene; though they were not always grateful to their best friends, who supported their usefulness, if at the same time they corrected their abuses. The gentle Shakespeare sometimes touched his superiors with a fine edged lancet: Ben Jonson was prompted, by his natural ruggedness, to strike them with a butcher's cleaver. In this manner, did he attempt to resist the Privy Council's order, in June 1600, "for the restraint of the immoderate use of Playhouses." In his *Poetaster*, which was acted, in the subsequent year, by the Children of the Chapel, he made *Tucca* say: "Thou shalt have a *monopoly of playing* confirmed to thee and thy *Covey*, under the Emperor's broad Seal for this Service (*d*)."
Johnson's sarcasm incited the

(*d*) By not knowing, that there had been such a restraint on the number of Playhouses, the learned Whalley supposed, that awkward stroke of the morose Jonson "to have been a slight gird at the practice of *monopolies*, now [then] growing into use." [Whalley's

the playhouse proprietors to persevere in opposing a salutary measure; and their perseverance, in obstinate error, induced the Privy Council to enforce, by severer injunctions, an useful regulation.

It is from those regulations, as they stand recorded, in the Council Registers, and the Statute Book, that we now know so many theatrical facts, which gave rise to the many conjectures of the historians of our stage. It was not known, or at least, had been little noticed, that, by a regulation of the fanatic Mary, which had been enforced by the wiser Elizabeth, plays had been looked into, and reviewed, even before Shakspeare came out into scenic life. This circumspection, in respect to the morals of youth, was carried to the two Universities, about the time, that Shakspeare began to write for the stage. From their attention to morality, the prudent councils of Eli-

Edit. 2. v. 99.] It cannot be too often repeated, that one fact is worth a thousand pages of erudite conjecture.

beth

zabeth extended their care to the interests of religion : As early as 1578, stage playing was forbidden in *Lent* ; and in 1587, the acting of plays, at the theatres, was prohibited on *Sundays*. For all the purposes of honest recreation, the number of playhouses was restrained to two, in 1600, the year when the bright Sun of Elizabeth began to set in Clouds.

The dawn of a new reign brought with it uncommon changes in the scenic world. The contemporaries of Shakspeare, who, at that epoch, were placed under a better regimen, almost all disappeared, with the effluxion of time, before the demise of James, in 1625. It is a curious fact, that at this epoch, the established Companies of London strolled often into the country ; owing, no doubt, to the multiplicity of associated players, and the paucity of attractive plays (*e*). A still more remarkable fortune

(*e*) It appears from Sir Henry Herbert's Official Register, that on the 1st of July, 1625, he granted a Confirmation of the King's Company's Patent to travel, for a year. [Rym. Foed. 18 T. p. 120.]

attended

attended the Playhouses than the actors. In 1589, there existed in, and about, London, only two; The *Theatre*, and the *Cur-tain* (f): Before the year 1629, there were erected, notwithstanding every opposition, fifteen additional Stages, or Common Play-houses, though these did not all exist, during the same period. In 1613, the Globe Theatre was burnt, by the negligent discharging of a peal of ordnance, during

(f) In Martin's *Month's Minde*, a scarce pamphlet, which was printed, in 1589, without the name of the publisher, it was said, scoffingly: "And the other now
 " wearie of our State mirth, that *for a pennie* may have
 " far better by odds, at the *Theater*, and *Curten*, and
 " any blind playing house, every day."—This whimsical writer, is supposed to have been Thom Nash:—
 " And this hath made the young youths his [Martins]
 " sons to chafe above measure especially with the play-
 " ers, whom saving their liveries (for indeed they are
 " her Majesties men, and these not so much as her
 " good subjects) they call *rogues*, for playing their *en-terludes*; and asses, for travelling *all day for a pennie*."
 —These Extracts shew better, than has yet been done, the number of the Play-houses, and the price of admission to them, about the year 1589, being the æra, probably, of Shakspeare's acquaintance with the stage.

the

the acting of Henry VIII; but, it was rebuilt, in the subsequent year, in a more commodious form, and with more splendid decorations. In 1617, the Fortune Theatre, in Golden-Lane, was also burnt, by negligence; but, was soon rebuilt, in a handsomer style. Five Inns, or Common Ostleries, were converted into Play-houses; also a Cockpit, and St. Paul's singing School; a Theatre was erected in the Blackfriars; and during the year 1629, another was established, in the Whitefriars (g). While Playhouses were thus destroyed, and built; while the managers of public amusements did not yield prompt obedience to public Authority; Sir William Davenant was empowered, on the 26th of March, 1639, to erect a new Theatre, near the *Three King's Ordinary*, in Fleet Street: But, on some disagreement with the Earl of Arundel, the Landlord, D'Avenant was obliged to relinquish a project, which he was ere long enabled

(g) Howe's Chron. 103-4.

to prosecute, in a different place, and form (*b*).

The

(*b*) The admirers of the Stage, and the lovers of truth, may be glad to peruse the Document, by which D'Avenant obliged himself to relinquish his purpose of building a Play-house in Fleet Street, which was copied from the original; and which was obligingly communicated by Mr. Craven Ord:—

This Indenture made the second day of October in the fifteenth yeare of the Raigne of our Sovereigne Lord Charles by the grace of God of England, Scotland, France, and Ireland King Defender of the faith &c. Annoq Dm 1639. Between the said King's most Excellent Ma^{ty} of the first part and William D'Avenant of London Gent. of the other part. Whereas the said King's most excellent Ma^{ty} by his highnes Letters patents under the great Seal of England bearing date the six and twentieth day of March last past before the date of theis presents Did give and graunt unto the said William D'Avenant his Heirs Executors Administrators and Assignes full power license and authority that he they and every of them by him and themselves and by all and every such person or persons as he or they shall depute or appoint, and his and their labourers servants and workmen shall and may lawfully quietly and peaceably frame erect new build and sett up upon a parcell of ground lying neere unto or behinde the three Kings ordinary in Fleet Streete in the pish of St. Dunstons in the West London, or in St. Brides London, or in either of them, or in any other ground in or about that place, or in the whole Streete
aforesaid

The internal œconomy of the Stage,
which our theatrical historians have labour-
ed

aforesaid already allotted to him for that use or in any other place that is or hereafter shall be assigned and allotted out to the said William D'Avenant by the Right Honor^{ble} Thomas Earle of Arundle, and Surry Earle Marshall of England or any other His Ma^y Commissionⁿ for building for the time being in that behalfe a Theater or Playhouse wth necessary tyring and retyring roomes and other places convenient conteyning in the whole forty yards square at the most wherein plays muscicall enterteynmⁿ scenes or other the like presentments may be p^rsented by and under certaine provisors or condicions in the same conteyned as in and by the said L^{res} patents whereunto relacon being had more fully and at large it doth and may appeare: Now this Indenture witnesseth and the said William D'Avenant doth by theis presents declare his Ma^y intent meaning at and upon the graunting of the said License was and is that he the said William D'Avenant his heires Executors Administrators nor Assignes should not frame build or sett up the said Theater or Playhouse in anie place inconvenient and that the said parcell of ground lying neere unto or behinde the Three Kings Ordinary in Fleet Streete in the said parish of St. Dunstons in the West London, or in St. Brides London, or in either of them or in any other ground in or about that place or in the whole Streete aforesaid, And is sithence found inconvenient and unfitt for that purpose, therefore the said William D'Avenant doth for himselfe his
Heires

ed to display, though not in absolute clearness, may receive some illustration from the sarcasm of a satirist, during King James's reign, who has been little noticed, by our

Heires Executors Administrators and Assignes and every of them covenante promise and agree to and wth o^r said Sovereigne Lord the King his Heires and Successers That he the said William Davenant his Heires Executors Administrato^r nor Assignes shall not nor will not by vertue of the said License and Authority to him granted as aforesaid frame erect new build or sett up upon the said parcell of ground in Fleet Streete aforesaid or in any other part of Fleet Streete a Theater or Playhouse, nor will not frame, erect, new build or sett up upon any other parcell of ground lying in or neere the Citties or Suburbs of the Citties of London or Westm^r any Theater or Playhouse unles the said place shall be first approved and allowed by warrant under His Ma^{ty} signe manuell or by writing under the hand and seale of the said Right Hon^{ble} Thomas Earle of Arundell and Surrey. In Witnes whereof to the one p^t of this Indenture the said William D'Avenant hath sett his Hand & Seal the Day and Yeare first above written.

William D'Avenant. L. S.

Signed Sealed and Delivered
in the prefence of
Edw. Penruddoks
Michael Baker.

scenic

scenic writers. In *Follies Anatomy*, by Henry Hutton, it was said, sarcastically (i):

- " Blackfriars, or the Paris-garden bears,
- " Are subjects fittest to content your ears.
- " An amorous discourse, a Poet's wit
- " Doth humour best your melancholy fit.
- " The Globe to morrow acts a pleasant play,
- " In hearing it consume the irksome day:
- " Go take a pipe of *To*, the crowded stage
- " Must needs be graced with you and your page:
- " Swear for a place with each controlling fool,
- " And send your hackney servant for a stool."

Whether Henry Hutton lived to write more of *Follies Anatomy*, at a later period, I am unable to tell: Another wit of an higher vein of humour found abundant materials, for his satyric muse, during subsequent scenes of religious, and political, Contention, " when civil dudgeon first ran " high." The remnant of the commons of England, in setting forth, parliamentarily, their own merits, to the general assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, boasted, " that they had suppressed all Stage Plays,

(i) Printed for Walbank, 1619, in 12mo.

and

“ and interludes, the nurseries of vice,
 “ and profaneness (*k*).”

— § X. —

OF THE MASTER OF THE REVELS.

HOWEVER curious this subject be in itself; because it is so much connected with our amusements; I fear I can add little to what I have formerly stated, either to gratify curiosity, by new notices, or to amuse the fancy, by more attractive views of an agreeable subject.

The reign of a Monarch, who reformed ancient establishments, with a very rough hand, gave origin to this establishment of the Revels, which was plainly a department of the Lord Chamberlain's Office (*a*).

(*k*) In a Letter from the House of Commons in England to the General Assembly of Scotland: Printed by Husband, in 1648.

(*a*) In the Apology, p. 472, it was said, that to the Lord Chamberlain belonged the high superintendence of *Coronations*, Funerals, and Cavalcades: I now find, however, that the Heralds, who are the proper Judges of such points, doubt, whether the Lord Chamberlain's authority extend to *Coronations*.

The

The year 1546, is the epoch of this new establishment, for the regulation of public Sports. Sir Thomas Cawarden, who died in 1559, had the rule of *unwelcome revelers*, during four reigns :

“ Of wondrous changes of a fatal scene,

“ Still varying to the last.” (b)

In those *various* changes, Sir Thomas Cawarden partook of his full share, both of merriment, and misfortune. After exhibiting before the gloomy Court of Mary, in April 1556, “ A *notorious mask* of Al-
“ maynes, Pilgrymes, and Irishmen,” he fell into disgrace (c). Whether it were, that the pulling down of St. Anne’s Church gave offence to the ruling powers, who were actuated by religious zeal, I know

(b) In Stow’s London, Edit. 1603, p. 343, it is said,
“ There is a parish church of St. Anne, within the precinct of the Blackfriars, which was pulled down with the friers church, by Sir Thomas Carden: But in the raigne of Queene Mary, he being forced to find a church to the inhabitantes, allowed them a lodging chamber above a staire, which since that time, to witte, the yeare 1597, fell down.”

(c) Apology, 478.

O

not :

not: But, it is certain, that he was obliged by the Privy Council, on the 7th of July 1556, to enter into a recognizance of £4000, to make his personal appearance, at a given time. He was committed to the Prison of the Fleet, on the 15th of May, 1557. And, having made no acknowledgment "of his ill misbehaviour to the "State," he was committed on the 14th of June 1557, to close prison, with only one servant, who was also shut up with him in rigorous confinement (*d*). From this hard imprisonment, he seems to have been relieved, by the general deliverance of a new reign.

Sir Thomas Cawarden was succeeded by Sir Thomas Berenger, or Benger, the second Son of Robert Berenger of Marlborough, in Wiltshire, by Agnes, the Daughter of William Vavasor of Spaldington, in Yorkshire (*e*). After receiving the ho-

(*d*) All those facts appear in the Privy Council Register of those dates.

(*e*) Col. Her. Vinc. Bucks, N o. 138, fol. 13.

nour of Knighthood, in 1553 (f), Benger became the successor of Cawarden, both in his troubles, and his office. In 1554, Sir Thomas Benger being accused of *Witchcraft* was committed to the Prison of the Fleet; with only his Servant, Hutton, to attend him. On the 7th of July 1555, he was bailed. On the 27th of April 1557, he was again brought before the Privy Council; was once more committed to the same prison: And, he was, soon after, sent to the Assizes at Oxford, where he was probably acquitted of whatever Crime he was accused (g). His sufferings under Mary were probably considered, when he was appointed Master of the Revels by Elizabeth, in January 1559—60. During the rule of Benger, he had the satisfaction to see a progress in the Drama, from rude beginnings, to more mature formation, be-

(f) Apology, 480; wherein, Strype's Memorials, vol. ii. Apx. 11, is quoted, mistakingly, for vol. iii. Apx. 7.

(g) Council-Registers, in the time of Mary, 257—261—278—610—629—638.

fore the genius of Shakspeare had produced a Tragedye, Comedye, or Historye, or our Poet's Witchery had enlivened the gloom of the ancient *moralities* of the English Stage. Having lived to behold *wondrous changes*, in the *varying scene*, Benger died in March 1577; without having enjoyed any influence, or having acquired any wealth.

Edmund Tilney, who is called *Magister Ludorum*, in the Registers of the Herald's College, succeeded the feeble Benger, in July 1579 (*b*). Tilney, who died in October 1610, lived however to see, with more satisfaction, than his predecessor felt, *immaturity* carried nearer to perfection, and with more vigour of mind to obtain a formal declaration of the precedence of his office (*i*). He saw the stage regulated, by the

(*b*) See a curious account of the Tylney's in Hearne's *Langtoft*, v. ii. p. 670-75. Edmond Tilney, the Master of the Revels, is said to have been the son of Edmond, not of Philip.

(*i*) [The following Certificate of the precedence of the Master of the Revels was extracted from the Records of the College

the highest Authority, and the Dramas reviewed by "honest, discreet, quiet, and
"godly,

College of Arms, by the obliging activity of Francis Townsend, Windsor.]

Whereas Edmond Tylney Esquier, Maister of y^e Queenes Ma^{tie} Office of the Revells, hath in regard of some controversies lately growne betweene him and others for the p^rcedency of their offices being verie unwilling as he saith eyther to p^rjudice his said office and his successors therein, or to challeng y^e unto himselfe y^e justly appteyneth vnto others: Required vs by vertue of our offices to sett downe truly y^e place of his said office according vnto our best Recordes concerning the same: Wee therefore Garter Clarenceux and Norrey Kings at Armes doe signifie by way of certificat vnto whome it shall concerne y^e y^e ordering and directing of all Princely Triumphes and Revells having ever bin an office of speciall Regarde and Accompt as well in forraine contries as within this realme: And because y^e cheife Comanders thereof have likewise bin placed in their precedency accordingly that in regard of the p^rmisses it was thought good by y^e Right Honorable y^e L. Burghley Lord High Treasurer of England and Deputy Earle Marshall for y^e tyme assisted wth S^r Christopher Hatton Lord Chancello^r of England and Henry L. of Hunsdon L. Chamberlen to the Queenes Ma^{tie} y^e then were wth others comysions for those causes assigned by Her Ma^{ty} in Anno 1588 y^e y^e said Maister of y^e Revels should be marshalled amongst other Officers of like note and accompt;

“godly, learned, men.” He had the honour of perusing Shakspeare’s plays, as they came from his plastic hand; and had the gratification to behold Shakspeare’s characters, as they were represented by Burbadge, Hemmings, and Condell; who, unhappily, did not leave:

“—— a better race to bring

“Into their vacant room.”

With the consent of Tilney, no doubt, and by his recommendation, perhaps, George Bucke, his kinsman, obtained a reversionary grant of the Office of the Revells, in June 1603; at which time, he was knighted, and appointed one of the King’s

and yet notwithstanding according vnto y^e antiquity of y^e office as he was by theire L^{ps} placed in y^e Recorde and ratefied vnder theire L^{ps} handes: Whereby y^e said Edmond Tylney Esquier Maister of the Revells is to myngle wth those Knightes Officers yt have theire p^{re}cedencies before all other Batchelor Knightes accordingly: And w^{ch} Record being our cheife and last Warrant may not be altered or infringed but by y^e the like authority otherwise then by the said Maister of y^e Revells owne curtesie and discrecon as wee conceive y^e same: Gyven from our office this xxvith of December in the xliii yeere of Her Ma^{ty} Raigne.

Gentlemen

Gentlemen of the Privy Chamber (*k*). In 1605, Sir George Bucke attended the Lord Admiral Howard, on his splendid embassy to Spain; wherein he was accompanied among other attendants, by four Lords, and twenty-six Knights (*l*). Soon after his return from Spain, Sir George began to act, as assistant to Tilney (*m*). Which-soever of the Dramas of Shakspeare,

(*k*) Apology, 488: What was said, in that page of Sir John Bucke being attainted for helping Richard to a horse on Bosworth-field, I have now reason to doubt, though Sir George Bucke had stated this, as a fact, in his History of Richard the Third.

(*l*) Old Biograph. Brit. 4th vol. p. 2679.

(*m*) The first play, which appears in the Registers of the Stationer's Company, as licensed by Sir George Bucke, was the *Fleire*, on the 21st of November 1606: On the 29th of June following, Mr. Tilney licensed *Cupid's Whirligigge*: and on the 4th of October 1608, Mr. Segar, the Deputy of Sir George, licensed *A Mad World my Masters*. These dates show, with sufficient distinctness, when Sir George Bucke began to act, as an assistant, and when as a principal, in the office of the Revels: And these dates also correct what was said, on this subject in the Apology, p. 488-9, and

Shakspeare, Sir George Bucke licensed for representation, he licensed but few of them for

confute what was stated by Mr. Malope, in his Shakspeare, vol. i. p. ii. p. 45.

The following plays were licensed by Sir George Bucke, as appears by the Stationer's Registers:

1606 6 May - *The Fleire*, provided Authority be got.

21 November By Assignment, a Comedie called, *The Fleire*.

1607 10 April - The Tragicall Life and Death of Claudius Tiberius Nero. [Anon.]

20 April - The Whore of Babylon.

22 April - The Faire Mayde of the Exchange.

9 May - The Phoenix.

15 May - A Comedy called Mychaelmas-Terne.

20 May - *The Woman Hater*; as it hath been lately acted by the Children of Powles.

3 June - The Tragedye of Busye Dambouse, made by George Chapman,

29 June - The Travilles of the Three English Brothers: As it was played at the Curten.

last

for publication. He appears to have been
“ a man well learned, and well read,
“ who

Last July - A Tragedie:—The Miserye of
Enforced Marriage.

6 August The Comedye of *the Puritan
Widow.*

————— *Northward Ho.*

A Comedie called, *What you Will.*

7 October Twoo plaies:—The *Revengers
Tragedie.*—*A Trick to Catch
the Old One.*

12 October A playe called, *The Family of
Love:*—as yt hath beene lately
acted by the Children of *his
Majesty's Revels.*

16 October The Tragedie of Alexander the
Sixt;—as it was played before
his Majesty.

22 October A plai—*The Merry Devill of
Edmonton.*

26 November Mr. Willm Shakespeare his His-
torye of Kinge Lear; as it
was played before the King's
Majestie at Whitehall upon
St. Stephens night at Xmas
last, by his Majesty's Servants,
playing usually at the Globe
on the Bankside.

who governed his scenic dominions, during difficult times, with great ability. He relinquished his administration to Sir John

- 1607-8 22 March *The Fyve Wittie Gallants*:—as it hath been acted by the children of the Chapell.
- 28 March A most wytty and merry conceited Comedie, called—*Who would a thought it*: or *Lawtryks*.
- 12 April - A B. *Humour out of Breathe*.
- 21 April - *The Characters of Twoo Royal Maskes*: Invented by Ben Johnson.
- 29 April - The 2nd p^{te}. of the convicted Courtisan, or Honest Whore.
- 20 May - *The Booke of Pericles Prynce of Tyre*.
Anthony and Cleopatra.
- 3 June - A Romane Tragedie, called *The Rape of Luerece*.
- 5 June - *The Conspiracy and Tragedie of Charles Duke of Byronn*: Written by Geo. Chapman.
- 6 October A playe of *The Dumbe Knight*.
- 1619 10 July - *The Temple Maske*.—An. 1618.
- 1621 6 October *The Tragedie of Othello*.

Astley,

Affley, about the end of the year 1621; and died, on the 22d of September 1623, as Sir Henry Herbert noted in his register; having lived to see the great actors of his time, successively go off the Stage, of representation, and of Life.

It is a fact, which has hitherto been unknown to the most diligent inquirers; and which is recorded in Sir Henry Herbert's Register, that Sir George Buck's books were burnt, though it appears not, whether by accident, or design (*n*). I suspect, however, that the MS. history of Richard, the III. which remains, to this day, in the Cotton Library, though greatly damaged by fire, may have been scorched, on that sad occasion. It is much to be lamented, that the books, and papers, of so ingenious a person, should have fallen a prey to so relentless a destroyer.

(*n*) On the 3d of May 1624, Sir Henry Herbert states, that he had licensed, without a fee, *Jugurth*, an old play, allowed by Sir George Bucke, and burnt, with his other books,

I was induced, chiefly, by the strong assertions of Mr. Malone (o), to doubt, whether *The History of the Reign of Richard III.* were written by Sir George Bucke, the Master of the Revels, or by George Buc, his relation. Further inquiry has convinced me, however, that there can be no controversy, where there is satisfactory information. In the Catalogue of the Cotton Library, which was compiled before the unlucky fire, that did such irreparable damage to that collection, this MS. is called "The
 " history of King Richard the third com-
 " prized in five books, gathered and writ-
 " ten by Sir G. Buc, Knight, Master of the
 " King's Office of the Revels, and one of
 " the gentlemen of his Majesty's Privy
 " Chamber; corrected and amended in
 " every page." The original MS. which still remains, in the British Museum (p), though it be greatly damaged by fire,

(o) Shakf. 1 vol. p^t. ii. p. 47, which contradicts the New Biographia, and Anthony Wood, who were both right, upon the point.

(p) Cott. MS. Tiberius E. X.

clearly

clearly proves, that the Catalogue is perfectly accurate. This MS. appears to have been the Author's rough draught; as it is corrected, by interlineations, and erasements, in every page. A part of the Dedication to Sir Thomas Howard, the Earl of Arundel, &c. still remains, together with "an advertisement to the Reader," which is dated "from the King's Office of the Revels, St. Peter's hill, the of 1619." This evidence, then, is decisive, in favour of Sir George Buck, as the real Author, against Mr. Malone. This *History* was first published, in 1647, by George Buck, Esquire, who says, indeed, in his Dedication to Philip the Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, "that he had collected *these papers out of their dust*:" Yet, was the publisher, whether he were the Son of Sir George, or some other relation, so disingenuous, as to assume the work as his own; and so interested, as to publish for his own profit, what, certainly, was the property of another. It seems to have been the fashion, in the age of Sir George Buck,

Buck, to vindicate Richard the III. but whether from the representations of Shakspeare, only, I am unable to tell: Sir William Cornewallis, the Younger, who wrote an *Essaye in prayse* of the *French Poesies*, published, before the decease of Shakspeare, an *Essaye*, in vindication, and praise, of King Richard the III. (q). Sir George Buck,

(q) I quote from the *Second Impression enlarged*, which was published, for Hawkins, in 1617.—With regard to this curious subject, I beg leave to subjoin a passage, which I found, written in a hand of the age of James I, on the margin of Ulpian Fulwell's *Flower of Fame*, 1575; wherein it treats “ of the Battaile fought
“ at Bosworth, betweene King Henry the VII, and
“ Richard that then usurped the Crowne:”—

“ Some peremtory or malicious writers (being blinded with ignorance and wanting the vnderstanding they professe to have) are not (only) content like some coblers to go beyond their lastes but in their ignorant presumption (being lead (onely) by popular examples, by their clark's imputations often defame those that deserve praise and comendation amongst which King Rich. iij. of famous memery (for all such virtues as may make a prince praise worthy) hath too largely (and against his desert) tasted of their inveterate spleene:—
but a just confutation of all their unjust and false imputations

Buck, who will be long remembered, for his learned labours, and from his Connection with the stage, resigned his administration of *The Revels* to Sir John Astley, in 1621.

Sir John, to whatever cause it were owing, relinquished the management of the Revels to Sir Henry Herbert, even before the decease of Sir George Buck (r). Sir Henry, no doubt, owed this early appointment to the management of the Revels, chiefly, to his relation, Philip, the Earl of Pembroke, the Lord Chamberlain; and partly to his Brother George Herbert, whose power of pleasing captivated King James (s).

During
putations are clerely and with truth wiped of from that innocent prince by the thrice noble and famous scoller St. G. Buc: in v bookes which hee hath (with special knowledge) written in King Richard's defence against all his malicious foes. DEUS JUVIT."

(r) Apology, 495.

(s) The successor of George Herbert, in the parish of Bemerton, the Rev^d. William Coxe, the well known
Tourist,

During the administration of Sir Henry Herbert, the Master of the Revels, as appears from his Official Register, exercised not only a peculiar jurisdiction over the stage, the plays, and the players, but also an unlimited authority over every other *show*; whether natural, or artificial; whether of trick, or ingenuity (1); with the yet greater power

Tourist, has informed me, from the Register of that parish, "That Mr. George Herbert, Esquire, Parson of Fuggleston, and Bemerton, was buried the 3d of "March 1632-3." He lies under the Altar, covered with a grave-stone, without any Inscription.

(1) Sir Henry Herbert granted, on the 20th August 1623, a license *gratis*, to John Williams, and four others, to make *showe of an Elephant*, for a year; on the 5th of September to make *showe of a live Beaver*; On the 9th of June 1638, to make *showe of an outlandish creature, called a Possum*; a license to a Dutchman to show two *Dromedaries*, for a year, for which, the licenser received one pound; a warrant to Grimes, for showing *the Camell*:—On the 14th of August 1624, a license was granted to Edward James to sett forth a *Showing Glass*, called the *World's Wonder*: On the 27th of August 1623, a license was granted to Barth. Cloys with three Assistants to make show of a *Musical Organ*, with divers motions in it; to make show of an *Italian Motion*;

power to allow, or disallow, the printing of books: For licenses on all those accounts,

Motion; to show a *Looking Glass*; to show the *Philosopher's Lanthorn*; to show a *Virginal*:—A license was granted to Henry Momford, and others, “for tumbling, and vaulting, with other tricks of flight of hand,” for a prize; at the Bull by Mr. Allen, and Mr. Lewkner; to William Sands and others to show “the *Chaos of the World*”; to show a motion called *the Creation of the World*; to show certain *freaks of charging and discharging a gun*; a license to Mr. Lowins, on the 18th of February 1630, for allowing of a *Dutch vaulter*, at their Houses, [the *Globe*, and *Blackfriars*.] A warrant was given to Francis Nicolini, an Italian, and his Company, “to dance on the ropes, to use *Interludes*, and *masques*, “and to sell his *powders*, and *balsams*.”—to John Puncteus, a Frenchman, professing *Physick*, with ten in his Company, to exercise the *quality of playing*, for a year, and to sell his *drugs*: On the 6th of March, a license was given gratis to Alexander Kukelson to teach the art of *musick* and *dancing*, for one year; A license to Thomas Gibson, to make shew of *pictures in Wax*: And, the master of the Revels appears also to have licensed books, during the reigns of King James, and Charles the 1st; he received a fee, for allowing Ovid's *Epistles*, translated into English; he received a fee, for a book of verses of my Lord Brook's, called *Gelia*; he received of Sayle, the Bookbinder, ten shillings, for
P allowing

counts, the Master of the Revels required a fee; and a Christmas box of forty shillings, from each of the established theatres. (u)

Sir Henry Herbert exercised those extensive trusts, during a long life, through difficult times, with great discrimination of judgment, and firmness of decision. He, no doubt, received some useful assistance from George Wilfon, who was sworn his Majesty's Servant, and a Groom of his Majesty's Revels, in ordinary, on the 4th of February, 1624-5 (x). Whether this office of Groom of the Revels were distinct from

allowing to be printed two other small pieces of verses, done by a boy of thirteen, called Cowley. I have now given sufficient specimens, out of a great variety, which appear on Sir Henry Herbert's Register; in order to evince the universality of the jurisdiction, which was, in those times, exercised by the Master of the Revels.

(u) The same Register also proves, that his usual fee for licensing a play, contrary to what was said in the Apology, p. 520, was twenty shillings, except when he had extraordinary trouble in making Corrections; and then he had forty shillings.

(x) Sir Henry Herbert's Official Register.

the

the Yeoman of the Revels, I am unable to explain: Certain it is, that William Hunt, and after him, Joseph Taylor, were Yeomen of the Revels, while George Wilfon was the Groom. With all those helps, Sir Henry Herbert's duty sometimes slept; owing to the multifarious nature of his office. When the sceptre of the stage was delivered into his hands, there appears from the record of his office, to have been four established companies of players; exclusive of strangers, who sometimes invaded their territories. The players, whether licensed, or unlicensed, seem to have been unruly subjects, who required vigilant superintendence, and powerful coercion. Refractoriness, in the governed, generally, produces tyranny in the rulers. During the turbulent period, which extended from 1623, to 1643, Sir Henry exerted the unbounded power over the dramatic world, which his royal masters were unable to exercise over the state. On the 12th of May, 1636, warrants were sent to the *four* companies to stop the plays, on account of the pest. Owing to the same

P 2

cause,

cause, Sir Henry, upon conference with the Earl of Essex, the Lord Chamberlain, concerning the plague, which had increased to a hundred deaths a week, sent warrants, by Mr. Louens, on the 5th of August, to the several playhouses, for the purpose of preventing their representations: The plague, having decreased to eighty six deaths a week, induced the Lord Chamberlain to open the theatres, for the profit of the players, and the amusement of the people.

But, they were only opened to be shut, ere long, by a power, which was full as destructive as pestilence. The Ruler of the Revels could exert little authority, when his subjects were dispersed, and his realms annihilated. Anarchy is sure to enfeeble, if it do not destroy authority. The re-establishment of his ancient jurisdiction, did not re-establish his power, even after the restoration had recalled the sovereign, and given energy to the laws. The Master of the Revels, while his power was opposed, felt himself unsupported: And, he was thus induced to retire to the quiet of the country,

try, and the enjoyment of his domain, from a scene, which he could neither rule, nor influence. Advanced to a mellow age, Sir Henry Herbert died, in 1673; having governed, almost half a century, with sound discretion, a

" ——— Calm region once,

" And full of peace, now tost and turbulent." (y)

While

(y) The subjoined Extracts, from Sir Henry Herbert's Official Register, are submitted, as a proper supplement to what has been said, with regard to the long Administration of that able Officer; and because they contain some new, and some curious facts:—

1622 10 May - A new Play, called, *The Blacke Ladye*, was allowed to be acted by the Lady Elizabeth's Servants,

10 May - A new Play, called, *The Welsh Traveller*, was allowed to be acted by the players of the Revels.

3 June - A new Play, called, *The Valiant Scholler*, allowed to be acted by the Lady Elizabeth's Servants.

10 June - A new Play, called, *The Duche Painter*, and the French *Branke*, was allowed to be acted by the Princes Servants at the Courtayne.

While the waves were yet heaving, from
the late storm, Sir Henry Herbert was suc-
ceeded

1623 27 July - For the Palsgrave's Players, a Tra-
gedy of Richard the Third, or
the English Profit, with the Re-
formation, written by Samuel
Rowley.

30 July - For the Prince's Players, A French
Tragedy of *the Bellman of Paris*,
written by Thomas Dekkirs and
John Day, for the Company of
the Red Bull.

August For the Company at the Curtain;
A Tragedy of *the Plantation of
Virginia; the profaneness to be left
out*, otherwise not tolerated.

19 August For the Prince's Servants of the
Red Bull; an Oulde Playe,
called, *The Peaceable King*; or
the Lord Mendall, which was
formerly allowed by Sir George
Bucke, and likewise by me.

21 August For the Lady Elizabeth's Servants
of the Cockpit; An Old Play,
called, *Match me in London*;
which had been formerly al-
lowed by Sir George Bucke.

29 August For the King's Players; a new
Comedy,

OF THE REVELS.] for the BELIEVERS. 215

ceeded by Thomas Killigrew, a poet, and a wit; but an officer of less discretion, with more

Comedy, called, *The Maid of the Mill*; written by Fletcher, and Rowley.

12 September For the Lady Elizabeth's Players; a new Comedy, called, *The Cra.... Marchant, or Come to my Country house*: Written by William Bonen. It was acted at the Red Bull, and licensed without my hand to itt; because they were none of the *four* Companys.

18 September For a Company of Strangers; a new Comedy, called, *Come see a Wonder*: Written by John Deye.

2 October For the Prince's Companye; a new Comedy, called, *A Fault in Friendship*: Written by Young Johnson, and Broome. [These were the *Son*, and Servant, of Ben Jonson.]

17 October For the King's Company, An Old Play, called, *More Dissemblers besides Women*: allowed by Sir George Bucke; and being free

more facilities. Having seen, during his youth, many revolutions in the state, and in

from alterations was allowed by me, for a new play, called, *The Devil of Dowgate, or Usury put to use*: Written by Fletcher.

1623 29 October For the Palsgrave's Players; a new Comedy, called, *Hardshifte for Husbonds, or Bilboes the best blade*, Written by Samuel Rowley.

19 November For the Palsgrave's Players; a new Tragedy, called, *Two Kings in a Cottage*: Written by Bonen.

28 November For a Strange Company at the Red Bull; *The Faiyre fowle one, or The bayting of the Jealous Knight*: Written by Smith.

3 December For the Queen of Bohemia's Company; *The Noble Bondman*: Written by Philip Messenger, gent.—This was allowed to be printed on the 12th March 1624.

4 December For the Palsgrave's Players; *The Hungarian Lion*: Written by Gunnel.

6 December For the King's Company: *The Wandring Lovers*: Written by Mr. Fletcher.

in his maturer age; various alterations, in the scenic world; he died, in March, 1683; the stage being then doom'd to feel:—

“ ——— A different Master, and a change of time.”

By

1624 2 January For the Palsgrave's Company;
The History of the Dutcheſs of Suffolk; which being full of dangerous matter was much reformed by me; I had two pounds for my pains: Written by Mr. Drew.

6 January For the Prince's Company; *The Four Sons of Amon*; being an Old Playe, and not of a legible hand.

26 January For the Palsgrave's Company; A Tragedy, called, *The whore in grain*.

3 March For the Cockpit Company; *The Sun's Darling*; in the nature of a masque by Deker, and Forde.

6 April - For the Fortune; a new Comedy, called, *A Match or no Match*: Written by Mr. Rowleye.

17 April - For the Fortune; *The Way to content all Women, or how a Man may please his Wife*: Written by Mr. Gunnel.

17 April

By this change, Charles Killigrew, became Master of the Revels, a person of more

- 17 April - For the Cockpit; *The Renegado, or the Gentleman of Venice*: Written by Messinger.
- 1624 3 May - For the Prince's Company; A New Play, called, *The Madcap*: Written by Barnes.
- 3 May - An Old Play, called, *Jugurth, King of Numidia*, formerly allowed by Sir George Bucke.
- 15 May - The Tragedy of *Nero* was allowed to be printed.
- 21 May - For the Palsgrave's Company; a Play, called, *Honour in the End*.
- 27 May - For the King's Company; A Comedy, called, *A Wife for a Month*: Written by Fletcher.
- 27 May - For the Prince's Company; A Play, called, *The Parricide*.
- 11 June - A new Play, called, *The Fairy Knight*: Written by Forde, and Decker.
- 3 September For the Cockpit Company; A new Play, called, *The Captive, or The Lost recovered*: Written by Hayward.
- September A new Tragedy, called, *A Late Murther*

more discretion than his predecessor, and of
equal

*Murther of the Sonn upon the
Mother: Written by Forde, and
Webster.*

15 September For the Palsgrave's Company; A
Tragedy, called, *The Faire Star
of Antwerp.*

14 October For the Cockpit Company; A new
Play, called, *The City Night
Cap: Written by Davenport.*

15 October For the Palsgrave's Company; A
new Play, called, *The Angell
King.*

22 October For the Palsgrave's Company; A
new Play, called, *The Bristowe
Merchant: Written by Forde,
and Decker.*

3 November For the Cockpit Company; A
new Play, called, *The Parlia-
ment of Love: Written by Mas-
finger.*

For the Palsgrave's Company; A
new Play, called, *The Masque.*
The masque book was allowed
of for the press; and was brought
me by Mr. Jon[son] the 29th
December 1624.

1625 25 January For the Prince's Company; A
new Play, called, *The Widow's
Prize;*

equal knowledge of the theatre(z). *Under different masters*, during five reigns, he endeavoured, by prudent management, to correct the *profaneness*, which was still found in plays, and to regulate the amusements

Prize; which containing much abusive matter, was allowed of by me, on condition, that my reformatations were observed.

8 February For the King's Company; An Old Play, called, *The honest Man's Fortune*; the original being lost, was reallocated by me, at Mr. Taylor's intreaty, and on condition to give me a book.

11 February For the Cockpit Company; A new Play, called, *Love-Tricks with Compliments*.

(z) Amidst the penury of anecdotes, with regard to Charles Killigrew, I will beg leave to add, that Dryden, speaking of Varronian Satires, says that, "Among the Moderns we may reckon the *Encomium Morie* of Erasmus, Barclay's *Euphormio*, and a volume of German Authors, which my ingenious friend Mr. Charles Killigrew once lent me." [Dedication of Juvenal's Satires, 1702. p. xlvii.]

of

of the scene. At length, dying in January, 1725,

“ ————— Amazed, he
 “ Beheld th’ amusive arch before him fly,
 “ Then vanish quite away.”

By the decease of Charles Killigrew, the disputed sceptre was delivered, in June, 1725, to Charles Henry Lee, a person of less power, and of more obscure existence. It was, during the unsuccessful management of his enfeebled authority, that the frequent rampancy of the *revelrout*, demanded the act, *for licensing the Stage* (a). He died, in 1744, after seeing various shifts of the scene; and beholding a new power impose on it additional restraints (b).

Solomon

(a) Apology, 537.

(b) I have been assured by the Reverend William Coxe, who is known by his extensive travels, and is respected for his literary labours, “ That Charles Henry Lee, the Master
 “ of the Revels, could not be the same Charles Henry Lee,
 “ who is said to have died, in 1744, leaving a minor widow,
 “ the administration of whose effects was granted [on the
 “ 24th of January, 1744, Apology 537] to Elizabeth
 “ D’Aranda, the mother, and curatrix assigned to Martha
 “ Lee, the widow of the deceast; because the said Charles
 “ Henry

Solomon Dayrolle succeeded, as Master of the Revels, to Charles Henry Lee, in April, 1744, though it is not easy to tell, wherein his office consisted; except that he had a lodging of no convenient extent, and a fee of no great value. His ancient jurisdiction had been transferred, in 1737, by legal authority, to a *Licenser of the stage*, and to the deputy licenser, who thenceforth performed between them, all the functions

“ Henry Lee was not more than twenty three years of age,
 “ when he died : He was page to the Princess Amelia, at the
 “ time of his death, which happened in November, 1743. The
 “ said Martha Lee married to a second husband Dr. William
 “ Coxe, Physician to the King, and was the mother of the
 “ said Reverend William Coxe, Rector of Bemerton.
 “ There was another Charles Henry Lee, his relation;
 “ they were both probably of the Litchfield family.”
 Such are the corrections of Mr. Coxe, from the traditions
 of his family. There was, no doubt, another William
 Henry Lee, who was the Master of the Revels : and who
 died, in the beginning of the year 1744; as Solomon Day-
 rolle was appointed his successor, in April, 1744. But,
 how to distinguish *Antipholis* of Ephesus, from *Antipholis* of
 Syracuse, is beyond my powers of discrimination. Here is
 a remarkable example of the foolishness of demanding de-
 monstration in the affairs of daily life!

of

of the ancient office of the Master of the Revels; and who are, to this day, empowered, by legal means, to execute the invidious trusts, which experience dictated, and policy conferred.

I have now supplied a few deficiencies, and corrected some errors of my own, and of others. The little, which my subsequent researches have been able to add to the full account, given in *the Apology, of the Master of the Revels*, I now offer to the admirers of the Drama, as useful supplements to scenic history.

§ XI.

OF THE STUDIES OF SHAKSPEARE.

OF such a writer, as this celebrated dramatist, who amuses the young, and instructs the old; who is admired the more, that he is the better understood; the universal wish must be, to know every authentic particular of *his private life*, and *literary history*, which are both involved in *palpable obscurity*, partly by the unskilfulness of his first biographers,

and

and partly by the prejudices of his subsequent Commentators.

Twenty years have elapsed, since Mr. Steevens wrote the life of Shakspeare, in three lines ; “ All that is known” says he, “ with any degree of *certainly*, concerning “ Shakspeare, is, *that he was born at Stratford upon Avon ; married, and had children, there ; went to London, where he “ commenced actor, and wrote poems, and “ plays ; returned to Stratford, made his will, “ died, and was buried (a).*” Short, as this biographical sketch is, it might have been shortened, by excluding the uncertain, and curtailing the verbose. The biographer, however, “ confesses his readiness to combat “ every *unfounded supposition* respecting the “ *particular occurrences of his life.*” Every rational man must concur in reprobating this hostile preparation :

“ Each mind is prest ; and open every ear,

“ To hear new tidings, though they no way joy us.”

Yet, if the meaning of this hostility be, to

(a) Mal. Sup. 1780. vol. i. p. 654.

combat every proposition, about the private life, and literary history, of Shakspeare, which is not supported by *demonstration*; every well informed person, who knows, that such enquiries do not admit of *demonstration*, must revolt against a mode of reasoning, which would destroy all the probabilities of life, and darken all the prospects of futurity. In fact, Mr. Steevens has done very little towards illustrating the life, and literary history of Shakspeare; while Mr. Malone has laboured, with incessant solicitude, to illustrate the obscure, and to ascertain the doubtful, with regard to both, during twenty years, although with no great success.

About the place, and time, of the birth of Shakspeare there has never been any dispute. Nor, is there much doubt, whether he learned his *small Latin* and *no Greek*, at the Free-school of Stratford upon Avon. It is full as certain that the grammatical institute, which instructed the energetic mind of Shakspeare, in the elements of latinity, was the grammar of Henry VIII: For, by Queen

Q

Elizabeth's

Elizabeth's Injunctions of 1559, it was directed, "that every Schoolmaster" shall "teach the grammar set forth by King Henrie the Eight of noble memorie, and continued, in the time of Edward the Sixth, and none other (b)." From those authorities, we may easily infer, what grammatical garden supplied Shakspeare with *The Ploures for Latine Spekyng*.

His English style, which is doomed to endure for ever; his poetic diction, which improved the language of his age; and his nervous manner, which rivets the attention of posterity, he derived from the vigor of his genius, and the spirit of the times: The prose of that period was poetic; as the dramas of the present day are prosaic.

The biographers, without adequate proofs, have bound Shakspeare an apprentice to some country attorney; as Mr. Malone has sent

(b) Injunction N^o 39: The Booke of certain Cannons, 1571. p. 25, enjoins, "that no other grammar shall be taught, but only that which the Queen's Majestie hath commanded to be read in all Schooles, through the whole realm."

him, without sufficient warrant, to the desk of some Seneschal of a county court: But these are obscurities, that require other lights, than conjecture, and assertion, which, by proving nothing, only establish disbelief (*c*). It can, however, admit of neither controversy, nor doubt, that Shakspeare, in very early life, settled in a *family way*, where he was bred; as he was born, in April 1564, was married in Summer 1582, and had a daughter, who was baptized, in May 1583. Where he thus settled, he probably resolved, that his wife, and family should remain through life; although he himself made frequent excursions to London, the scene of his profit, and the theatre of his fame (*d*). It is still uncertain

at

(*c*) Apology, 553.

(*d*) The Register, which records the successive baptisms, marriages, and deaths, of his children, incidentally, records the residence of Shakspeare's family, in Stratford upon Avon; in 1583—1585—1596—1607—1615—1616.—This evidence is so satisfactory, that it has compelled even Scepticism to admit my position to be very *probable*. It is moreover, remarkable, that both Ben Jonson, in his commendatory verses, and the Player-editors of Beaumont and

at what epoch he made his first excursion to London. He had attracted some notice, as early as 1592; he was praised, in 1594; and he was celebrated, in 1598, at the age of thirty-four, as one of the greatest poets of the reign of Elizabeth.

Whatever may have been the first production of his pen, certain it is, that his *Venus* and *Adonis* was written, in 1592; or at least, before 1593, when Field, the Bookseller, recorded it as his property, after having received the Archbishop's license. It is more than probable, that he had read Wilson's *Art of Rhetorique* (e), Ascham's *Scholemaster*, the *Arts of Poesy* of Webbe, and of Puttenham; and perhaps Sydney's *Defence of Poetry*: Yet, as Shakspeare said, by Warton, "to have been only a reader by accident (f). He, certainly, was not the fel-

Fletcher's Works, in their Dedication to the same Philip Earl of Pembroke, to whom Shakspeare's Dramas had been dedicated, in 1623, call Shakspeare "the sweet Swan
"of Avon," the place of his residence.

(e) Apology, 559—560—562.

(f) History of Poetry, v. iii. p. 393.

low of a College, if this honour be necessary to constitute a reader by system. Shakspeare, however, not only read much in the volume of life; but our poet was an attentive peruser of the books, which related to *his faculty*: And, noting down in a *Common-place-book*, what he had read, or observed, he prepared, diligently, to write for immortality (g).

Whoever peruses with any attention, the volumes of Shakspeare, will readily recognize the extent of his reading, and the carefulness of his notation. In *the Apology*, I quoted a curious passage from Marston, a contemporary satirist, as a proof of my position: But, the application of this passage to Shakspeare has been disputed by the anonymous critic before mentioned (h). The chief objection is, that the satirist, merely, meant to draw characters in the *general*, without any *particular* allusion. But, is this remark warranted by *the fact*? The answer must be, that it is not. His first character, says the critic, “is that of a man

(g) *Apology*. 568-9. (h) *Brit. Crit.* v. ix. p. 518.

“ whose rage is dancing.” No: not of a man; but of a *particular* man, the writer of a poem on dancing: “ Praise but *Orchestra*,” says Marston, “ and the *skipping art*.” Now; who wrote *Orchestra*? The answer must be, Sir John Davis, the celebrated author of *Nosce Teipsum*, wrote the poem on dancing, entitled *Orchestra*. And, the satirist, immediately, adds,

“ ——— They’ll revel with neatt jumps

“ A *worthy poet* hath put on their pumps.”

We have here Sir John Davis, particularly, described, as a worthy poet, who wrote *Orchestra*. But, had the satirist, Shakspeare in his mind? Yes, in the preceding verse the satirist cries out:

“ ——— A hall! A hall!

“ Roome for the Spheres, the orbes celestial

“ Will dance Kemp’s jigge.”

We have here more *particularity*; the positive mention of *Kemp*, a living player; and an allusion to Shakspeare, a living dramatist; as, indeed, he had, in a preceding satire of the same collection, 1599, exclaimed “ A
“ Man! a Man! a Kingdom for a Man!”
And, must I, in a controversy with a com-
mentator

mentator on Shakspeare, *demonstrate*, that Marston meant, herein, to parody Richard the third's well known exclamation on Bosworth Field (i)? After all those *particularities*, and *allusions*, the satirist, immediately, subjoins the character, not of a dramatist, but of a special play-writer; the writer of *Romeo and Juliet*, which play is mentioned, at the outset of the character, as the preface to it.

Yet, cries the Critic, "Is this a picture of our beloved Shakspeare?" I answer, yes, expressly: I have already proved, that the satirist was not writing of fictitious characters, but of *living Characters*: He mentions the *Orchestra* of Davis, the *Jigge* of Kemp, the *Romeo and Juliet* of Shakspeare. The commentators, Mr. Steevens, and Mr.

(i) It is a fact, which cannot be disputed, that Marston was, in 1599, very intimately connected with Ben Jonson, who was then at variance with Shakspeare: Marston, and Jonson, afterwards quarrelled; as such poets could not long be friends: Marston again parodied Shakspeare, in his *What you will*, 1607, wherein he says; "Looke ye, I speak play scrapes."

Q4

Malone,

Malone, have shewn, by an enumeration of particulars, that Shakspeare has scarcely written a play, that he did not borrow from some preceding drama, from some Chronicle, or novel; taking from them, as suited his dramatical purpose, sentiments, scenes, expressions, and passages: The commentators, then, must be, equally, bound by what they admit, as they must be convinced by what they prove. I have already shewn, that "Our beloved Shakspeare," undoubtedly, borrowed from the wealthy Spenser.

I will repeat, what I have already said, and prove, what is plainly demonstrable, viz. that Shakspeare was a diligent reader, and *copious collector*. The contemporary of Shakspeare, Webster (*k*), who knew him perfectly, says, in the preface to the *White Devil* (*l*), what the commentators, and critics, would do well to profit by: "*Detraction is the sworn friend to ignorance*: For

(*k*) For Webster, see the *Biographia Dramatica*, in vol. i. p. 465.

(*l*) Webster's *White Devil* was published, in 1612, 4°; and in 1631, 4°.

“ mine own part, I have ever truly cherished
“ my good opinion of other mens worthy
“ labours, especially, of that free and
“ heightened style of Master Chapman:
“ The laboured and understanding works of
“ Master Jonson : The no less worthy com-
“ posures of the both worthily excellent
“ Master Beaumont, and Master Fletcher :
“ And, lastly, (without wrong last to be
“ named) the right happie and *copious in-*
“ *dustrie* of M. Shake-speare, M. Decker,
“ and M. Heywood ; wishing what I write
“ may be read by their light.” Impossible,
cries the Critic ! Would Webster, who was
himself a dramatist, rank Shakspeare after
Chapman, Ben Jonson, Beaumont, and
Fletcher ; and only place our illustrious dra-
matist, at the last, with such scriblers as
Decker, and Heywood ; and merely speak
of Shakspeare’s *copious industry* ? The *positive*
fact is a decisive answer to the question. The
critic-commentators, and commentator-crit-
ics, seem unable to carry their minds back
to the age of Shakespeare ; and to judge of
men

men, and of things, according to the sentiments, and practices, of the same age.

“ Oh fie! fie!” cries the Critic; “ from
 “ such discoveries may we be ever free!
 “ This, Shakspeare; a fellow, that never
 “ speaks but when plays, and players, are
 “ the subject; or speaks only common
 “ place scraps, which he had written in a
 “ book (m).” Yes; such is the Critic’s
 parody on the satirist’s character. The fact
 is, Shakspeare did delight to speak about
 his profession; Garrick delighted to speak
 about his profession; and other men of ge-
 nius delight, in the present day, to speak of
 their professions; because it is human nature
 to do so.

I have now proved, I trust, in opposition
 to the Critic, that Marston meant to draw
particular, and not *general*, characters; se-
 condly, that he spoke, especially, of Shak-
 speare; thirdly, that our dramatist was deem-
 ed, in his day, by those who knew him, to
 be a writer of *copious industry*; and, fourthly,

(m) Brit. Crit. 9 vol. 518.

that Shakspeare did delight to talk of his profession (n): Nor, is there any thing to be deducted from the personal character, or the fair fame of Shakspeare, if those positions be admitted, in their full extent:

“ Bring, then, his merits to a strict account;

“ Make fair deductions; See to what they mount.”

I will produce another Satirist to make deductions from the character of Shakspeare, without fearing, that it will be lessened in the amount. Ben Jonson’s fifty-sixth Epigram, “ *On Poet-ape*,” was intended, I believe, as a lampoon on Shakspeare. Thus:—

“ Poor *Poet-ape*, that *would be thought our chief*,

“ Whose works are e’en the frippery of wit,

“ From brokage is become so bold a thief,

“ As we, the robb’d, leave rage, and pity it.

(n) The Critic goes out of the character, which the Satirist drew, and which I applied, and do apply, to Shakspeare, when he reprobates the Character, because it is said, that our great Poet “ had an inability to talk of any thing but plays and players.” [Brit. Crit. 9 v. 518.] This is a quite different proposition, which shows, that the Critic has yet a lesson of candour to learn.

“ At

" At first, he made low shifts, would pick, and glean ;

" By the *reversion* of old plays, now grown

" To a little *wealth*, and credit in the scene,

" He takes up all, makes each man's wit his own :

" And, told of this, he flights it. Tut ! such crimes

" The sluggish gaping Auditor devours ;

" He marks not whose 'twas first, and after times

" May judge it to be his, as well as ours.

" Fool, as if half-eyes will not know a fleece

" From locks of wool, or shreds from the whole piece."

Fie ! Fie ! Fie ! cries the Commentator-Critic : We will not believe, that Ben Jonson would write such a lampoon on Shakspeare ! Why will you not believe it ? because, say ye, you do not *demonstrate* the truth of the imputation. Nay ; my position does not admit of *demonstration* : I only propose to support my belief by *probability*. I will, however, say with Gonzales :

" Whether this be,

" Or be not, I'll not swear :

And apply to the Commentator-Critic, with *Prospero* :

" You do taste

" Some subtilties o' th' isle, that will not let you

" Believe things Certain."

In order to enable us to decide what we ought to believe, in these matters, as *things certain*

certain, we must look back upon the early management of our theatres. The papers of Henslowe, the well known manager of so many theatrical companies, which Mr. Malone procured, for a valuable consideration, from Alleyn's College, at Dulwich, throw many flashes of light on this obscure subject. It is apparent, from these manuscripts, that the poets of the days of Elizabeth, and of James, supplied the stage, with dramas, more for profit than for reputation. If we except Ben Jonson, perhaps, there were none of the dramatists, including Shakspeare, specifically, who cared for literary reputation. The managers of the theatres, who paid their money for plays, considered these plays, as so much their own, that they could either curtail them, or make *addycions* to them: In fact, they often paid one set of poets, to alter the dramas of another set; without considering the literary reputation of the original author. (a)

(a) See Steev. Shak. vol. ii. p. 444 to 489.

It

It is to those causes, that we must trace up the circumstance of so many despicable dramas being attributed to Shakspeare, which he never wrote, but which may have been altered, either by additions, or curtailments: Hence, *Pericles*, *Lochrine*, *Sir John Old Castle*, *Lord Cromwell*, *The London Prodigal*, *The Puritan*, *The Yorkshire Tragedy* (p); were all attributed to Shakspeare, during his life time, by interested booksellers, without caring for consequences, either immediate, or remote. Of the company, which usually acted at The Globe Theatre, Shakspeare was, no doubt, the reviser of the plays, which were offered for representation; and the person, certainly, who made additions, and curtailments: From this view of the subject, it is easy to perceive how completely Shakspeare had, within his power, the whole of the Dramas, which were acted at *The Globe*.

It is a curious fact, which has been little noticed, that Shakspeare, as reader of his company, altered Ben Jonson's *Sejanus*, be-

(p) Mr Malone's Suppl'. 1780. v. 2.

fore it was acted, in 1603: Ben, however, was too proud, or self-sufficient, to allow Shakspeare's alterations to stand, when he afterwards printed this tragedy; as an appeal from the audience, who had damned it, to the public, who might save it. On this occasion, Jonson informed "the readers, that
 " this book, in all numbers, is not the same
 " with that, which was acted on the public
 " stage; wherein, a *second pen* had good
 " share; in place of which, I have rather
 " chosen to put weaker, and, no doubt,
 " less pleasing of mine own, than defraud
 " *so happy a genius* of his right, by my
 " *loshed Usurpation*." Whalley asserts, that the *happy genius*, before alluded to, was undoubtedly Shakspeare (g). To this truth, add another circumstance, which is, that Shakspeare never appears to have acted in any of Ben Jonson's dramas, after the representation of *Sejanus*, in 1603.

There was certainly a quarrel between the two great dramatists of that accomplished

(g) Whalley's Ed. Jonson's Works, vol. ii. p. 130.
 period.

period. In the Cambridge Comedy, called *The Return from Parnassus*, Kempe, the witty player, is made to say, in 1602: "Oh! that
 " Ben Jonson is a pestilent fellow: He
 " brought up Horace, giving the poets a
 " pill; but, our fellow Shakspeare hath
 " given him a purge, that made him bewray
 " his credit." In what *this* purge consisted, it is not easy to tell: Shakspeare may have purged *Sejanus* from its crudities, when it was referred to him, for revisal, and amendment: And, Ben Johnson was plainly offended by Shakspeare's amendments. Add to all these particulars, that Marston was, at that period, in the frequent practice of courting Jonson, but of scoffing Shakspeare.

From this excursion, into the purlieus of the theatres, let us return to Jonson's Epigram on *Poet-ape*. Who, then, in the contemplation of Ben Jonson, was the *Poet-ape*? The answer is, " he, that would *be thought*
 " *our Chief* (r); " the *Chief* of the dramatic
 poets

(r) As early as, 1592, Shakspeare was satirized by Robert Green, " As an *upstart Crow*, beautified with our
 " *feathers*

poets; whose works, in the envious judgment of Ben, "are e'en the fripperie of wit." This Poet-ape would buy *the reversion of old plays as a broker*; But, by *brocage*, the Poet-ape had grown to a *little wealth* and *credit in the scene*. Now, what dramatic poet, in that age, except Shakspeare, grew to a *little wealth*, and *credit in the scene*? *The Poet-ape makes each man's wit his own*. The two commentators, who have just been quoted, Mr. Malone, and Mr. Steevens, have shewn, clearly, how many of the dramas of Shakspeare were taken from preceding plays: Shakspeare, then, *made each man's wit his own*; yet, his commendation is, that he

"*our feathers*" [the Poet's feathers.] This *upstart Crow* "supposes he is as well able to bombaste out a blank verse as the best of you; and is, in *his own conceit* "the only *Shake-scene* in a Country." [Steev. vol. i. 486; Mal. vol. i. p. 273.] The imputations cast on Shakspeare by the two satirists, Green, and Jonson, are so much alike, that it is inferable, Jonson must have had his eye on the sarcasms of Greene. Mr. Malone, and Mr. Steevens, after him, both agree, that the *Shake-scene* of Green was the Shakspeare; the chief of the Dramatic Poets.

R

was

was the industrious *bee*, “ which stole the
 “ *honey-bag* from the *bumble bees*.” Tut!
 this *honey-bag*, “ the sluggish, gaping, au-
 “ ditor devours ;”—nor, “ marks whose
 “ ’twas first ; and oftentimes may judge it
 “ to be his, as well as ours.” Such was
 the malignity of Ben! The eye, which con-
 templates those various circumstances, must
 be blind, indeed, if it do not see, that Shak-
 speare was *The Poet-ape* of Ben Jonson.
 Nor, was Jonson at all overawed by Shak-
 speare’s superiority ; a superiority, which his
 self-sufficiency lessened, and his malice re-
 viled. Jonson had even the *Audacity*, ac-
 cording to Mr. Malone’s expression, which
 Mr. Steevens has adopted, “ to write a play,
 “ after our author, on the subject of King
 “ Richard III. (s)” And, this act of auda-
 city furnishes an additional probability, that
 the same audaciousness would lampoon the
 man, whom Jonson hated, and deride the
 poet, whom a rival did not fear.

When Shakspeare had paid to Heaven the

(s) Steev. vol. ii. 484.

debt he owed, Jonson came forward with a copy of verses, which were prefixed to our poet's dramas; although the poor panegyrist has been sufficiently penurious of his praise. But, Shakspeare was not any longer the mark of his resentment, nor a rival's success the object of envy. And Jonson's awkward panegyrick on the poet, when dead, whom he had derided, while living, can only be considered, as the effusions of insincerity, without the merit of commendation. It is to be remembered, also, that, subsequent to the decease of Shakspeare, Jonson spoke of him, contemptuously, to Drummond of Hawthornden; saying, "that Shakspeare wanted
 " art and sometimes sense; for he had ship-
 " wrecked some mariners, in Bohemia,
 " where is no sea, so near as a hundred
 " miles." (1)

Whatever Jonson might say, I strongly

(1) Drummond's Works, Ed. 1711. p. 225: Drummond the amiable, and acute, Drummond remarked of his friend Jonson "that he was a great lover and praiser
 " of himself; a great contemner and scorner of others."

[lb. 226.]

suspect, that sometimes Shakspeare, like Marston, *willingly erred* (u). Shakspeare, was not only a better poet, but was also a man of more discernment, and intelligence, than Marston; though perhaps not so good a scholar. While Shakspeare was yet young, the field of geography was much cultivated, on the Continent, by Mercator, and Ortelius; by Hondius, and Magini. During the reign of Elizabeth, voyages, and travels, had been made over the whole globe. Those parts of Science, which are connected with navigation, and geography, were much studied, in England, during the same period by Cunningham (x), by the Diggeses, and Bourne (y), and Blundville; by Wright

(u) In the preface to the *Malcontent*, 1604, Marston avowed, "that he had *willingly erred*, in *Supposing a Duke of Genoa*." Marston dedicated *The Malcontent* to Jonson, as a mark of his esteem.

(x) The *Cosmographical Glasse* was published, in 1559, by William Cuningham, Dr. in Physicke.

(y) See William Bourne his Booke, called, *The Treasure for Traveilars*, 1598: Of the Citie of Prague [the capital of Bohemia] he says, "the Long. is 38
" Degrees

Wright (*z*), Hill (*a*), and Olyver (*b*). Even before the year 1599, a controversy arose, between Wright, our countryman, and Hondius, who was brought by Wright, to confess, that he had published, as his own, some discoveries in the theory of Navigation, which had been made by his opponent. There were published, in the same age, Chorographical descriptions of particular countries: And, travels into every part of Europe, Asia, and Africa, were published to the English world, during the whole period from 1592, to 1615; a period, in which Shakspeare exerted his

" Degrees 20 Min. the Lat. 50 Degrees 6 Min. and is
" East, and a lytle to the South, 700 myles from Lon-
" don."—There was published at London, in 1599, *A*
Brief Description of the Whole World; Wherein [Sign.
A. iii.] "*Bohemia* is described as a kingdome in the
" middle of Germanie, which is compassed round with
" a mightie Wood, called, *Silva Hicimia* [Hercinia]:
" The chiefe citie whereof is called Prague."

(*z*) Certain errors in Navigation by Edward Wright, 1599.

(*a*) *The School of Skill*, by Thomas Hill, 1599.

(*b*) *The new Handling of the Planisphere*: by Thomas Olyver, 1601.

vigorous faculties to instruct, and please, by his immortal dramas (c): And, Shakspeare must have known, therefore, the situation of *Bohemia*, in the middle of Germany; but, it suited the purpose of his muse to err, willingly. Shakspeare appears, then, to have been *the reader*, on whose judgement, and help, *his fellows* relied, for satisfactory opinions, with regard to the adoption of every play: But, he was never the manager of the company, as I have formerly intimated (d); because Hemminge, and Pope, were the managers from 1596, to 1604; when Cundel succeeded, in this department, on the death of Pope. If it be true, as I have also proved, that Shakspeare never removed his family to London, but continued through

(c) There was published by Norton, the King's Printer, at London, in 1606, "*The Theatre of the Whole World*: set forth by that excellent Geographer "*Ortelius*." This great work was consecrated by Norton to King James: The maps were in Latin; but the descriptions were in English. It is more than probable, that such an eye as Shakspeare's must have looked on this *Theatre of the World*.

(d) Apology, 597.

life,

life, *the sweet swan of Avon*, he could not, owing to his distance from London, attend to the common concerns of the company, as a manager (e); nor was he diverted from his studies, by the dull duty of providing
 “ Clownes Sewtes, and Hermetes Sewtes,
 “ and dievers other apparel, for the tier
 “ house (f).”

Shakspeare's *muse*, not wholly bent on what was gainful, pursued sometimes studies less dramatical. And she produced, not in her infancy, but in her prime, *The Sonnets* which Mr. Steevens supposes to have been one of her *earliest* compositions (g). Certain it is, however, that Shakspeare wrote his Sonnets, subsequent to the publication of Spenser's *Amoretti*, in 1595, and, probably, during the year 1597; in which year they were handed about in manuscript, among the *friends of his soul* (h).

It

(e) Apology, 597-8.

(f) Henflowe's *Enventary*, Steev. 2. vol. 459-461.

(g) Mal. Supl. 2 vol. p. 594.

(h) *The Wit's Treasury* of Meres, which was sent to the Press in the Summer of 1598, speaks of “ Shaks-

It has not yet been settled, upon such decisive circumstances, when Shakspeare began to write for the stage. Neither has it been fixed, by such facts, nor ascertained by such deductions, as defy criticism, and preclude investigation, in what succession, he wrote his comedies, tragedies, and histories. I propose to show, in the sequel, that, on this interesting head, our commentators have written with more elaboration, than certainty: "People forget how little they know, when they grow confident, upon any present state of things."

It is an investigation much more easy, in the pursuit, and more pleasing in the detail, to exhibit the course of study, which enabled Shakspeare to produce five and thirty dramas, within a short period of his life. This great performance of a vigorous mind could not have been atchieved, if Shakspeare had not been a *diligent reader*, and a *copious collector*, as I have already shown. Langbaine was

"peare's Sugred Sonnets among his private friends."
p. 281.

the

the first (*i*), who pointed out distinctly, the track of Shakspeare's reading, in Italian Novels, English Chronicles, and Plutarch's Lives, as translated by North. A list of the classic authors, which had been translated, into English, has been since compiled, and published; in order to prove, that Shakspeare might have known ancient history, without being a classical scholar. It was reserved for the laborious Capel, to give to the world *The School of Shakspeare*; exhibiting "authentic extracts from divers English books that were in print, in that author's time; and, evidently, showing, from whence his several fables were taken, with some parcels of his dialogue." This volume is not only a work of extraordinary labour, but is a compilation of great use to those, particularly, who are not so fortunate as to pos-

(*i*) In his *Momus Triumphans: Or the Plagiaries of the English Stage*: Printed, in 1688, 4°. In this work, Langbaine shows more reading, than the late Mr. Thomas Warton, and his followers, were disposed to allow him. The Commentators have all borrowed, copiously, from Langbaine, without acknowledgement.

sess

self the original writers. The researches of Capel evince, that Shakspeare cultivated a very wide field of study; and the poet's dramas demonstrate, that he had read, with attentive discernment, and treasured up for use, with appropriate distinctness, what he had read. Capel, while compiling *The School of Shakspeare*, thought more of himself, than of others: And, when he ceased to labour, others thought more of themselves, than of him. Although *present time doth ever boast itself above a better*; Yet, future times are the true appretiators of the real merits of the past.

It must be acknowledged, however, that Capel was a man of but narrow comprehension, a writer of confined views; as his *School of Shakspeare* evinces. The studies of Shakspeare were commensurate with the English literature of his age: And, *the School of Shakspeare* ought to contain not only the novels, the English Chronicles, the Greek, and Roman Lives, as they had been translated by North; but also the whole history of *letters*, during the reign of Elizabeth:

Elizabeth : The progress of philological learning, the cultivation of the more practical parts of science, such as geography, and navigation ; and the denization of foreign erudition. Without taking in all those various departments of learning, it is impossible to show, by what artifices of study, Shakspeare acquired such various knowledge, communicated so many lessons of practick morality, and conveyed his instructions, in language, at once, easy, energetic, and sublime.

He, who undertakes the difficult task of writing *the School of Shakspeare*, ought to be extremely attentive to the current of our language, during the poet's life, as it passed along before him ; in order to catch the words as they rose, or sunk, during the different periods of an improving age. The commentators on this great writer have not always been sufficiently observant, in these respects ; to the flux, and efflux, of our speech, and to the innovations of our grammar : and they have sometimes done injustice to Shakspeare, by not attending, accurately

rately, to the double meaning of words, the past, and the present. I formerly exemplified this remark (*k*), by a quotation from *Midsummer's Night's Dream*: "No night is now with hymn, or *carol* blest." The commentators explained this, which is sufficiently obvious to those, who know our ancient phraseology, by saying, that hymns, and *Carols*, were sung in the time of Shakspeare; but without adverting, that both in the past, and the current sense, to *Carol* signified to dance. (*l*)

Neither the compiler of *the School of Shakspeare*, nor the commentators on his works, have been sufficiently attentive to another operative part of writing, during the period of our poet. I allude, particu-

(*k*) Apology, 565.

(*l*) To *Karole*, in Langtoft's Chron. means to dance: See Hearne's Glos. in Vo.—without any other signification; so in Robert of Glocester: But, at the Epoch of Shakspeare's appearance in the Theatre, the same word had acquired the double meaning, of to sing, as well as to dance. [Gram. Anglicana, 1594, in the Glossary.]

larly

larly, to the practice of punctuation, which I formerly noticed (*m*). It is apparent, from the Elementary Treatises, which Shakspeare must have read, before he began to write, that punctuation had not then been finally settled; though its practice had been often taught. Among other writers, Puttenham treated of this subject, in his *Art of Poetry*, 1589 (*n*): And, in speaking of the *Cæsure*, he notices the Comma (,); the colon (:); the period (.); but, not the semicolon (;), which was not then known, either in the theory of composition, or the practice of typography: It was, therefore, said by Johnson, upon just considerations, that the punctuation of Shakspeare's text is in the power of every commentator. (*o*)

Yet, with the truth of this observation before them, our late commentators have not been very studious to point the text of Shakspeare, upon any systematic principles; neither with any justice to their author, nor

(*m*) Apology, p. 390-5.

(*n*) P. 61. (*o*) Apology, 590.

with any assistance to their readers. This observation could be demonstrated from any play, in any of their volumes: But, I will exemplify my observations, by a few quotations from *All's well*:—

“ Yes, [;] Helen, you might be my Daughter-in-

“ Law; [:]

“ God shield, [!] you meant it not! [;] daughter, and

“ mother,

“ So strive upon your pulse: [.] What, [!] pale

“ again? [;]

“ My fear hath catch'd your fondness: (p)”

I have pointed this passage, by the interpolations, within the brackets, as the sense appears to require; as distinctness demands, and propriety confirms. In order to give the Countess's observations the gravity, and weight, which comport with her years, and her character, there must be a semicolon [;] after yes, and a colon [:] after law; the point of interjection [!] ought to follow God shield; for there ends the prayer. There ought to be a full point [.] at pulse; because there ends the sense. The Countess does not mean, as the commentators sup-

pose, to ask a question ; but, to utter an exclamation, when she cries out: " What! " pale again;" For, Helen cannot tell, whether she herself be pale, or no; nor, can she, in her circumstances, help her paleness. But, the commentators are, continually, confounding the points of interrogation, and interjection; as almost every page evinces. As an illustration of this remark, take an example, from the same play, in the Scene, between Lafeu, and Parolles (q):

Laf. Your Lord [,] and master [,] did well [,] to make his recantation.

Par. Recantation? My Lord? My Master?

The indignant affectation of Parolles, clearly, requires, that there should be points of interjection, where the commentators have placed points of interrogation: Recantation! My Lord! My Master!

Laf. Ay; Is it not a language, I speak?

Par. A most harsh one; and [,] not to be understood [,] without bloody succeeding. My Master? (!)

The consideration of the greatest impor-

(q) Ib. 266.

tance,

tance, next to the giving of the text, truly, ought to be, to point it accurately: For, without just punctuation, the text is unsettled; the sense is marred; the reader is confounded; and, the inexperienced players are, continually, misled in their studies, and embarrassed in their delivery.

These observations, I thought it necessary to make, in justice to the fame of Shakspeare, who is thus injured, by carelessness; and to my own argument, whilst I am illustrating the poet's *studies*: These remarks were also due to the admirers of Shakspeare, who are constantly told, that *his text is now settled*; and that the late editions are, at length, *immaculate*.

After writing his plays, "Shakspeare *re-*
" *turned* to Stratford," says Mr. Steevens, in his biographical breviary, "made his
" will, died, and was buried." These general positions may be readily admitted, as they were easily stated, without requiring absolute demonstration; though it be not quite so certain, as the biographer supposed, whether Shakspeare wrote his dramas at
London,

London, or Stratford, or on his frequent journies, from the one to the other. It is true, however, that his will was recorded, though it is still a point of uncertainty, when, and by whom, it was originally published. This publication was attributed by Mr. Malone, and by Mr. Steevens, after him, to Theobald, with reprobation of the blunders, it contained. From the aspersions of hyper-criticism, I endeavoured (r) to vindicate Theobald, who was certainly guiltless, either of the blunders, or the publication. For, six years before the will was published, Theobald had left

“ ——— This earthly world, where to do harm

“ 'Tis often laudable; to do good, sometimes

“ Accounted dangerous folly.”

In vindicating an editor, who had deserved well of the admirers of Shakspeare, I said (s), that the will was certainly published, with the original errors, in the *Biographia Britannica*, in 1763, for the *first time*, as I believed. I formed this *belief*, by comparing the first, and second, editions of

(r) Apology, 425-7.

(s) Apology, 426.

Theobald, with the Biographia, in 1763, without seeing Theobald's third edition, of 1752, which I have since seen, by accident. In this *third* edition of Theobald, if any such there really were, the will of Shakspeare was published, by the booksellers, six years after the decease of the editor (1). I looked, without success, in the Prerogative Office, for a will of Theobald, who probably died, as poets often die, and as hath been before remarked, without much property, for an executor to manage, or an

(1) The will was thrust into this Edition between the Preface and the Text; it was printed in a different character from the Preface; was paged in a different series; and makes eight pages, or one half sheet. I have a strong suspicion, that this was only a pretended Edition, with a new *Title page*, and, with the addition of the Will. For, the last paragraph of the Preface speaks of the former Edition, not Editions; And the Will is obviously printed, in a quite different letter, from the Preface, and the Text. Nor, is this Edition of Theobald, in 1752, mentioned either by Mr. Steevens, or Mr. Malone, whose reprehensible silence, if such an one there were, led my *heavy ignorance* into a petty error. My notion is, that this fabricated Edition of 1752, was intended to oppose Warburton's Edition of 1747.

heir

heir to enjoy. From the *Biographia Dramatica*, I said, that Theobald had died in 1742: But, Mr. Reid states, with greater probability, that he died shortly after the 6th of September, 1744; and on the 20th of the subsequent October, his library, comprehending two hundred and ninety-five old English plays, was sold, at auction, by Charles Corbet (u). The will of Shakspeare was published again, in the *Biographia Britannica*, in 1763, as I formerly intimated (x). It was republished by Johnson, in 1766, with all the errors. Capel seems not to have known, when he published his Shakspeare, in 1768, that the poet's will had then been published (y). The will was published again by Mr. Steevens, in 1778,

(u) Steev. Shak. 1793. vol. i. 331.

(x) Apology, 426.

(y) At the conclusion of his Introduction, p. 74, when instructing the Biographer how to write a Life of Shakspeare, he recommended, as an existing memorial, "his last Will and Testament, *stant nunc* at Doctors Commons."

also with the original errors(z). But, Mr. Malone has the unrivalled merit of having first published the poet's will, from a collation with the original, in the prerogative office. I have now rectified one of the errors, which the critic aforesaid left, in an unlucky moment, "to the care of Mr. Malone. (a)" I should have been happy to have seen all my "hateful errors," distinctly, exhibited; that I might have had the gratifying pleasure of self-rectification: But, whatever were the imperfections of *The Apology*, it has no errors in it, which affect the argument. The error, in believing the will of Shakspeare to have been published

(z) See the Edit. 1778. vol. i. p. 198-9. *Bushaxton*, for *Bishopton*, *reserved* and *preserved*, for *received* and *perceived*; my *brown best bed*, for my *second best bed*: Mr. Steevens also says, mistakingly, [Ib. 198] "It appears from the Registers in Doctors-Commons, that Richard Burbage died in 1629: Yet, the Parish Register proves, that he was buried on the 16th of March 1644." Mr. Malone rectified many other errors of Mr. Steevens.

(a) Brit. Crit. vol. ix. 520.

by the booksellers, in 1763; instead of 1752, does not invalidate the argument, wherein I vindicated the deceased Theobald, against the late Enquirer, who charged him with publishing what he never published. The sarcasms of ignorance always sharpen the weapons of ridicule; as want of candour is sure to receive its retribution.

Whether Theobald, whom, I have thus rescued from the posthumous attack, of the living commentators, will be defended, with equal ease, from another attack, of a different kind, by a very different person, I do not pretend to foresee. I mean the attack, which was made by Pope, at the end of his edition, in 1728, and which has been little noticed by subsequent editors. Johnson retained the notes of Pope; "that no fragment of so great a writer may be lost:" Adopting the same apology, I will subjoin a passage from Pope, which appears to be as characteristic of that celebrated poet, as any sentiment in his various writings:

"Since the publication of *our* first Edition, there
"having been some attempts upon Shakspeare pub-

“ lished by Lewis Theobald, (which he would not
 “ communicate during the time wherein that Edition
 “ was preparing for the Press, when *we*, by publick
 “ Advertisements, did request the assistance of all lovers
 “ of this Author) *we* have inserted, in this impression,
 “ as many of 'em as are judg'd of any the least advan-
 “ tage to the Poet; the whole amounting to about
 “ twenty-five words.

“ But to the end every Reader may judge for him-
 “ self, we have annexed a *complete List* of the rest;
 “ which if he shall think *trivial*, or *erroneous*, either in
 “ part, or in whole; at worst it can spoil but a half
 “ sheet of paper, that chances to be left vacant here.
 “ And we purpose for the future, to do the same with
 “ respect to any other persons, who either thro' *can-*
 “ *dor* or *vanity*, shall communicate or publish, the least
 “ thing tending to the illustration of our Author. *We*
 “ have here omitted nothing but *Paintings* and meer
 “ errors of the Press, which I hope the Corrector of
 “ it has rectify'd; if not, I cou'd wish as accurate an
 “ one as Mr. Th. [if he] had been at that trouble, which I
 “ desired Mr. Tonson to solicit him to undertake. (b)

“ A. P.”

I will apologize for the *presumptuous* Theo-
 bald, in *presuming* to know any thing of
 Shakspeare, by quoting a couplet from an

(b) See this very curious passage of such a writer at
 the end of the Index to the 8th vol. of the Edit. 1728, as
 a Preface to the *various Readings*.

excellent

excellent poet, who was also a good judge, and an amiable man:

"THEOBALD, tis thine, to shew what Shakspeare writ;
"But, POPE shall reign Supreme, in Poetry, and Wit."(c)

The conceitedness of Pope, naturally, suggested what his petulance easily uttered, that there neither was before him, nor ever would be after him, any writer, who was fit to revise the dramas of Shakspeare. Whatever Pope might think, or his partizans proclaim, the charm was dispelled, by the appearance of Theobald's edition, in 1733 (d). The admirers of Shakspeare had now the satisfaction of seeing, in the more accurate pages of Theobald, *what Shakspeare writ*. This laborious editor, plainly, travelled on the right road: It was yet reserved for others to travel farther, in the same track, with greater strength, and hap-

(c) See DUNCOMB'S Epigram, on the Contest, between Pope, and Theobald, in NICOLS'S Col. of Poems, vol. vi. p. 7.

(d) Of Theobald's Edition, there were printed no fewer than 12,860 copies; for which he received not less than 652*l.* 10*s.* [Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 449.]

pier success. Hanmer showed, indeed, by his edition, in 1744, that he did not always follow the steps of Theobald: Yet, his presumption, in pretending to know any thing of Shakspeare, roused the indignation of Warburton, who had lent a few notes to Theobald. The ebullition of Warburton's various passions of contempt, and disdain; of resentment, and emulation; appeared throughout his edition, which he published in 1747. Every reader of this book was dissatisfied; because no one approves magisterial dictation: And, Edwards came, in a lucky time, with his *Canons of Criticism*, to free their minds from the bondage of a tyrant. After the preparation of many years, came out, with a milder air, a greater master, Johnson, in his edition of 1765. Mr. Steevens appeared, in 1766, as the coadjutor of Johnson, whose previous edition was rather endured, than approved. After working under ground, for years, mole like, Capel came into open day, with his edition, in 1768, which was criticized, and

and forgotten (e). After the works of Capel, followed the several editions of Mr. Steevens, and of Mr. Malone; the latter of whom had furnished his immediate predecessor with *several supplements*. To the successive labours of these last editors, Mr. Ritson, made objections, in several publications, which have not hitherto been satisfactorily answered. It is, from this short survey, apparent, that each succeeding editor of Shakspeare has, in some degree, superseded the former. It may easily be observed, that the present editors, Mr. Steevens, and Mr. Malone, think, and talk, with Pope, that their labours preclude future editions of other editors, who cannot possibly hope to equal their performances, and perfections. I will only say, with the wise man, “That to every thing there is a

(e) There were published after the decease of Capel three 4^o. volumes, in 1779, and 1780; consisting of a Glossary, Various readings, Notes, Indexes, and *The School of Shakspeare*: But, the whole is so uncouth, as to be extremely repulsive; and so full of affectation, as to be often unintelligible.

“season,

“season, and a time to every purpose.” Shakspeare alone, who has had the fate to be misrepresented by most of his editors, is immortal; such was the extent of his genius, and such the course of his studies.

§ XII.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF SHAKSPEARE'S DRAMAS.

WHEN Mr. Malone had attempted “to ascertain the order, in which the plays of Shakspeare were written,” Mr. Steevens, warmly, declared, “that he had so happily accomplished his undertaking, that he only leaves me the power to thank him, for an *arrangement, which I profess my inability* either to dispute, or to improve.” This panegyrick was made, in 1778 (a). And, though twenty years have elapsed, since that attempt, this *happy arrangement* has neither been disputed by him, nor improved by others (b). I propose, however,

(a) Steev. Shak. Ed. 1778, vol. i. p. 268.

(b) Mr. Malone has, however, disputed his own preconceptions, as to this Chronology; and has improved his

however, whatever may be my ability, or success, both to dispute, and to improve, this applauded Chronology, in the following observations, which I offer as an *Apology* to Mr. Steevens, for presuming to know any thing about Shakspeare; in order to show him, that a *novice* can perform, in twenty days, what a *master* has acknowledged his inability to achieve, during twenty years (c).

Considering

his own argument, by throwing out of it Seven of the spurious plays, and by changing the positions of several of the genuine Dramas. [Compare Mr. Steevens's Edit. 1778, vol. i. p. 274, with Mr. Malone's Ed. 1790, vol. i. p. 266, and Mr. Steevens's Ed. 1793, vol. i. p. 470-617.] And, Mr. Steevens has, laudably, followed the example of Mr. Malone.

(c) Mr. Steevens might have, surely, corrected an instance of *false grammar*, which has stood, in this Chronology, upwards of twenty years; to the scandal of Criticism, and the reproach of Editorship: "The precise *manners* of the puritans *was* [were] at this time much ridiculed." [Mal. vol. i. 352.] Mr. Steevens adopted this palpable error, without perceiving its dissonance to grammar rules. [Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 577.] Whalley, who was a Scholar, according to Johnson, wrote, very differently: "*These*
" manners

Considering the paucity of materials, which have come down to us, with regard to the private life, and literary annals, of so interesting a poet, every attempt to ascertain some additional fact, to adduce some new circumstance, or to inculcate some useful principle, may justly claim attentive indulgence, from the admirers of Shakspeare. I must say, with Mr. Malone, and Mr. Steevens, "that nothing very decisive can be produced, on this subject: "*Probability alone* is pretended to," say they (*d*). When such critics only promise *probabilities*, it is not for me to offer *demonstrations*: Nor, is it, for them, to call for demonstration from me, after they have claimed *probability*, as an indulgence, for themselves. But, I propose to show, that their Chronology is erroneous; and to sub-

"manners, and most others, which the poet has painted, are agreeable to the character, and suitable to his design." [Upton's Crit. Observ. 2. Ed. 73.] See the word *manners* in Johnson's Dict. which is, always, in the plural, when it signifies *Studied Civility, &c.*

(*d*) Steev. Shak. 1793, vol. i. p. 475.

mit

mit to the admirers of Shakspeare a juster order, by establishing new facts, and adducing pregnant circumstances :

" Of old, those met rewards, who could excel :

" And, those were prais'd, who but endeavour'd well."

Shakspeare appears to have been as prematurely forward in his personal constitution, as he was preternatural in his genius : Although he was born only in 1564, he became a husband, in 1582, and a father in 1583. He thus entered the world, at an age, when less forward youths have scarcely escaped from the discipline of the school. Like other pregnant wits, he may have written amatory verses, while he felt the powerful incentive of love : And, he produced the Poem of VENUS *and* ADONIS, "*the first heir* of his invention," before he had fallied from Stratford, probably; but certainly before he was known to fame (e) :

" A graver subject could not him content

" Without love's foolish lazy languishment."

(e) This Poem was entered in the Stationer's Register, on the 13th April, 1593; and was, probably, published, in the subsequent year: It was licensed by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Shakspeare

Shakspeare, however, was unknown, as a poet, to Webb, in 1586 (f); and to Puttenham, in 1589 (g): Neither was Shakspeare known, as a dramatist, to Harrington, in 1591 (h); Nor to Spenser, in any character, at the same epoch (i). It is a curious

(f) When he published his *Discourse on English Poetry*.

(g) When he printed, anonymously, *The Art of English Poesy*.

(h) Sir John Harrington, when treating of Dramatic Poetry, in his *Apology for Poetry*, did not notice Shakspeare.

(i) It seems impossible, that Spenser, who went to Ireland, in 1580, where he continued to reside till he was finally expelled, though he made some excursions to England, could know any thing of Shakspeare, at so early a period, as 1590; and, consequently, could not allude to him in the *Tears of the Muses*, a poem, which was first published, in 1591; and which contains the lamentation of *Thalia* for the death of pleasant *Willy*, who died of late. Sir Philip Sydney is obviously intended by Spenser, who, probably, wrote this, some time before the publication: Sydney was long lamented by the contemporary poets, contrary to the conception of the two Commentators: There were published, in the *Phoenix Nest*, 1593, several Elegies, on Sir Philip Sydney.

curious fact, that Shakspeare was, originally, noticed, by the malignant eye of satire; and was, first, mentioned, by the sarcastic pen of lampoon. It was Robert Greene, who, (like other writers in our own times,) is better known by the vices of his heart, than the products of his head, thus scoffed at Shakspeare, when he wrote, in 1592, his *Groats-worth of Witte bought with a Million of Repentance*. When dying of want, Robert Greene addressed a warning to his fellow wits, against trusting to plays, for a livelihood, and to players, for rewards. "Yes; trust them not," said he, "For, there is an upstart crow, beautified with our feathers, that with his tyger's

Sydney. I suspect, however, that Gabriel Harvey, the literary Dictator of that period, did allude to Shakspeare, in his "*Four Letters especially touching Robert Greene and other parties, by him abused,*" which were printed by Wolfe, in 1592: It is in the *third* letter, which was dated from London, on the 9th of September 1592, wherein he says: "I speak generally to every springing wit; but, more especially to a few: and, at this instant, *singularly*, to *one*, whom I salute with a hundred blessings."

"heart,

“ heart, wrapped in a *player's hide*, sup-
 “ poses he is as well able to bombast out a
 “ blank verse, as the best of you; and be-
 “ ing an absolute *Johannes factotum* is, in
 “ his own conceit, the only SHAKE-SCENE,
 “ in a Country.” It was Mr. Tyrwhit,
 who, acutely, applied this passage to
 Shakspeare: It was Mr. Malone, who first
 published this decisive proof, that Shak-
 speare had written for the stage, as early as
 1591; and had, by his success, attracted
 the notice of disappointment, and incited
 the scoffs of envy (*k*). But, this proof may
 be carried a little further back; and may be

(*k*) Mal. Shak. vol. i. 272-3. Greene, however
 did not live to publish his *Groats-worth of Wit*: After
 his death, in September 1592, Henry Chettle per-
 formed that service, for the real author; as Mr. Malone
 has evinced, from the acknowledgement of the pub-
 lisher. [Id.] But, of this fact, I have an additional
 proof, which seems to have escaped the Commentator's
 notice: There was entered, in the Stationer's Regis-
 ters, for William Wrighte, on the 20th September,
 1592, “ uppon the *perill* of Henry Chettle, *Green's*
 “ *Groat's worth of Wyt*, bought with a million of repent-
 “ *ance*.”

equally

equally applied to some other important points : Shakspeare appeared to the eyes of Greene, as “ an absolute *factotum*” of the stage. This expression proves, incidentally, that Shakspeare had become, as I have intimated, *the reader of plays for his Theatre*, at an earlier epoch : And, he may have read, and amended, *Titus Andronicus*, in 1589 ; and may have read, and amended, *Pericles*, in 1592, *Lochrine*, in 1593, Sir John Oldcastle, in 1598 ; as he, certainly, did read, and amend, Ben Jonson’s *Sejanus*, in 1603. As Shakspeare was thus scoffed at, by a lampooner, in 1592, is it not reasonable to infer, that he who, in modern times, has been acknowledged as our greatest dramatist, might have been lampooned by a satirist, in 1599, when the public voice, had not yet allowed him that pre-eminence ?

We have now obtained something more than probability, that Shakspeare, was a reader, and writer, of plays, as early as 1591. Yet, it is a question of some difficulty to ascertain, which of his *genuine* dramas, he first wrote : Nor, is it any answer

T

to

to this question to say, that he read, and improved, the plays of others; that he added a letter, or a word, or a line, or a thought, to *Titus Andronicus*, in 1589, or to the *first part* of Henry VI, in 1592; all which seem now to be acknowledged, as the works of other poets, though Shakspeare may have fitted them for the stage.

No. I.—THE COMEDY OF ERRORS, 1591.

With regard to the true epoch of this Comedy, there have been various periods assigned to it, according as opinion fluctuated, between conjecture, and certainty (*1*): This play was originally given to the year 1596; yet, afterwards, was fixed to 1593; owing to a want of attention to facts, and, a defect in the mode of argumentation, upon the point. It was known to Meres, in 1598, who mentions it in his *Wits Treasury*. It could not be written, said Mr. Malone, before 1596; for Warner's translation of

(1) Steev. Ed. 1778, vol. i. p. 292; Mal. vol. i. 288; Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 503.

Plautus's *Menæchmi*, *from which the plot was taken*, was not published till 1595. Mr. Ritson, whose opinion, on such topics, deserves great attention, declares, that Shakspeare had not the slightest obligation to Warner's translation. In this judgment, Capel concurred, when he said, "that this Translation furnished Shakspeare with nothing but his principal incident (*m*)."
 The two commentators are at length disposed to admit, that Shakspeare may have derived some intimations, from prior writers, on the same subject. The *doggerel measure*, and the *alternate rhimes*, are, also, allowed to be obvious proofs, that they are the production of an inexperienced writer.

The *only note of time*, that is said to occur, in this play, is the allusion to France being armed for war against her heir (*n*). Now; in 1591, Queen Elizabeth sent Lord Essex with four thousand men, to assist

(*m*) Shak. vol. i. p. 51.

(*n*) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 503.

Henry IV, against his opponents. This is a remarkable fact, which fixes the allusion to 1591. That able, and artful, Prince more effectually promoted his own interest, by embracing the religion of France, in July 1593; which step led to his coronation, in February, 1594: It is apparent, then, that the events of 1594, and 1593, could not have induced Shakspeare to speak of France, as then "armed; making war against the heir." The name of *Dowfabel*, which is mentioned, in the *Comedy of Errors*, also occurs in the *Shepherd's Garland* of Drayton, which was printed, in 1593: Yet, it is not easy to ascertain, whether Shakspeare borrowed from Drayton, or Drayton from Shakspeare: They both probably found the name, in some common original; as Shakspeare found the plot of his play in some unknown prototype.

But, there is another note of time, in this comedy, which the two Commentators have over-looked; and which is more striking, and more instructive, than the allusion,

sion, which is mentioned by them, of the repugnancy of France to Henry IV; that they, unconsciously, learned from reprobated Theobald (o). The play opens with the trial of Ægeon, a merchant of Syracuse, who went to Ephesus, contrary to *an act of trade*:

" Ægeon: Proceed, Solinus, to procure my fall;
And, by the doom of death, end woes, and all.

Solinus. Merchant of Syracuse, plead no more:
I am not partial to infringe our laws.
The enmity, and discord, which of late
Sprang from the rancorous outrage of your Duke
To merchants, our well dealing Countrymen,
Who, wanting gilders to redeem their lives,
Have seal'd his rigorous statutes with their bloods,
Excludes all pity from our threatening looks:
For, since the mortal and intestine jars
'Twixt thy seditious Countrymen and us,
It hath in solemn synods been decreed,
Both by the Syracusans, and ourselves,
To admit *no traffick* to our *adverse towns*:
Nay, more:
If any, born at Ephesus, be seen
At any Syracusan marts, and fairs:
Again, if any Syracusan born,

(o) Theob. Shakf. v. iii. p. 208-9.

Come to the bay of Ephesus, he dies,
 His goods confiscate to the Duke's dispose;
 Unless, a thousand marks be levied,
 To quit the penalty, and to ransom him."

These allusions to the rivalry of trade are so particularly marked, as to relate, plainly, to the commercial transactions of that eventful period. In 1589, Queen Elizabeth seized sixty ships, belonging to the Hans Towns, which were carrying warlike stores to Spain (*p*). In 1590, the Hollanders complained of the English depredations on their trade (*q*). In 1591, there were commercial complaints between England and Denmark. In this year, the English merchant-adventurers were expelled from Staaden; but were favoured by Elbing (*r*): Here, then, are the *adverse towns*, which are so emphatically mentioned by Shakespeare. Add to those applicable facts, that the Lord Admiral was commanded, in July, 1591, to arrest all *Hamburgh* ships, and

(*p*) Anderfon's Chron. Hist. of Com. vol. i. p. 434-5.

(*q*) Id.

(*r*) Ib. 439.

goods,

goods, for satisfaction of four hundred and sixty pounds to George Leate. These were all very striking events to a commercial city, which, when mentioned by the poet, must have been felt by the inhabitants of London: And, those facts, when coupled with the allusion to the repugnance of France to Henry IV, fix the time, when this Comedy of Errors was written, to 1591 (s).

In act the 4th, Dromeo of Ephesus says, "Mistress, *respice finem*, respect your end." This explanation induced Warburton to refer the reader to a pamphlet of Buchanan, against Liddington, which ended with the repetition of the wise man's warning, *Respice finem, Respice finem*. But, this lampoon of Buchanan, which was published, soon after the birth of Shakspeare, had been forgotten when our poet wrote his *Comedy of Errors*. I suspect, that Shakspeare may

(s) Before the decease of Shakspeare, it had become proverbial to give this appellation to different Dramas, of a comick kind: Anton cried out, in his Philosophical Satires, 1616, p. 51. "What *Comedies of Errors* swell the Stage!"

have seen the same expressions in *The Eighth Liberal Science*, or *The Art of Flattery*, which was published, in 1579, *Respice finem* (1); "*Alls well that ends well* (2)."

NO. II.—LOVE'S LABOURS LOST.

The frequency of the rhimes, the irregularity of the versification, the diversity of the dialogue, and the defects of the composition; all conspire to evince, that this comedy is one of the earliest dramas of the muse of Shakspeare. It was, certainly, written before September, 1598; because, it is mentioned by Meres, in his *Wit's Treasury*. It was, particularly, noticed in *Alba*, or the *Month's Mind of a melancholy Lover*, which was published, in 1598. It was, originally, assigned to the year 1591 (3); yet, has it been, finally, fixed, by the editors, to 1594 (4); though the reasons, for this choice, are very insufficient to justify the alteration.

(1) 7. Steev. 288. (2) Sign. E. iiiii.

(3) Steev. 1778, vol. i. p. 280.

(4) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 509.

The *Love's Labours Lost* was first printed, in 1598. It is said, in the title page of this edition, that it had been acted before Queen Elizabeth, at Christmas, 1597, and to be *newly corrected, and augmented*. This comedy was revived, then, in 1597, and enlarged, in the outline, which had been sketched in some prior year: But, there is no satisfactory reason given, by the commentators, for fixing the epoch of this sketch, in 1594, or in any other year: It is merely thought probable by them, that the first draft of this play was written in, or before, 1594 (z).

The fifth act of this very early drama opens with that *finished representation* of colloquial excellence, which was so emphatically mentioned by the late Doctor Johnson:

“ I praise God, says Nathaniel to Holo-
 “ phernes, your reasons at dinner were
 “ sharp and sententious; pleasant, without
 “ scurrility; witty, without affectation;
 “ audacious, without impudency; learned,

(z) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 511.

“ without

“ without opinion; and strange, without
 “ hurry.” But, none of the commenta-
 tors seem to have adverted, that the outline
 of this representation was borrowed from
 Sydney: In the *Arcadia*, which was first
 published, in 1590, speaking of the fair
 Parthenia, of whom Sydney says, “ that
 “ which made her *fairness* much the *fairer*
 “ was, that it was but a *fair* ambassador of
 “ a most *fair* mind (a), full of wit, which
 “ delighted more to judge itself, than to
 “ shew itself: her speech being as rare as
 “ precious; her *silence*, without *sullenness*;
 “ her *modesty*, without *affectation*; her *shame-*
 “ *facedness*, without *ignorance* (b).” Here,
 then, was the original, in 1590, from which
 Shakspeare copied, in 1592.

In the 5th Act of *Love's Labours Lost*,
 we may perceive much of Muscovy, and
 Muscovites; of Russia, and Russians. War-

(a) Shakspeare, in the 5th Act, repeats the epithet
fair; “ A holy parcel of the *fairest* dames.”—There are
 repetitions of *fair* Lady, and *fair* Lord. [Steev. 1793,
 vol. v. p. 326.]

(b) Bk. i. p. 17. of the folio Edit.

burton has well remarked, without stating, indeed, any document for his assumption, "that the settling of commerce in Russia was, at that time, a matter that much engrossed the concern, and conversation of the public(c)." This conversation, and that concern, engaged the attention of the court, and city, most particularly, in 1590, and 1591 (d).

NO. III.—ROMEO AND JULIET.

This captivating drama is, probably, one of the earliest productions of Shakspeare; and is, certainly, the first tragedy, which proceeded from his pen. Like other plays of this great dramatist, *Romeo and Juliet* was merely a sketch, in its first draught, which was afterwards filled up, and, successively, improved; it was at length printed, in 1597, though not in its most perfect form.

There is plainly an allusion to the Faerie

(c) Steev. 1793, vol. v. p. 319.

(d) Hackluyt, vol. i. p. 498-9, of the Ed. 1598.

Queen,

Queen, the three first books of which were published, in 1590; and which was, continually, present, in our poet's mind; Mercurio, in his airy, and satiric speech, cries out:

"O, then, I see Queen Mab hath been with you.

"She is the *fairies* midwife; and she comes,

"In shape no bigger than an aggat stone

"On the fore-finger of an Alderman."

Shakspeare, when he sat down to sketch Romeo and Juliet, had another poet, also of that period, in his mind, who was even in his eye, while he wrote the fifth act: And, the similarities, between their two works, are so many, and so striking, as to leave no reasonable doubt, whether Shakspeare borrowed from Daniel, or Daniel from Shakspeare. In every question of this kind, the probability lies against Shakspeare, who, like the bee, constantly draws sweets from every weed:

DANIEL:

"And nought respecting death, the last of pains,

"Plac'd his *pale colours*, (the ensign of his might,)

"Upon his new got spoil: &c.

SHAK-

SHAKSPEARE :

- " ——— beauty's *ensign* yet
" Is crimson in thy lips, and in thy cheeks,
" And Death's *pale flag* : &c.

DANIEL :

- " Decayed roses of discoloured cheeks
" Do yet retain some notes of former grace,
" And ugly *Death* fits fair within her face.

SHAKSPEARE :

- " Death, that hath suck'd the honey of thy breath,
" Hath had no power yet upon thy beauty.

DANIEL :

- " Ah! now, me thinks, I see *Death dallying* seeks
" To entertain itself in love's sweet place.

SHAKSPEARE :

- " ——— shall I believe
" That unsubstantial *Death* is amorous." (e)

Daniel's Complaint of Rosamond, from which Shakspeare plainly borrowed, was entered in the Stationers' Registers, on the 4th of February, 1592, and was soon after praised by Nash (f), in his *Pierce Penny-lesse* his *Supplication to the Devil* (g). We

(e) Steev. 1793, vol. i: p. 519. (f) Ib. 518.

(g) This work of Nash was entered in the Stationer's Registers for Richard Jones, on the 8th of August, 1592; being licensed by the Archbishop.

may

may easily presume, then, that what had attracted others, had drawn the attention of Shakspeare, early in 1592. This presumption is carried up to probability, by what we hear of the nurse's talk, in the first act; who says, characteristically, "*that it is now*" "*since the earthquake eleven years.*" Shakspeare had been reading Gabriel Hervey's *Three proper Letters*, which were printed, in 1580, and which gave an account of *the earthquake*, which happened in April of that year. This note of time was first mentioned by Tyrwhit, to whose opinion great regard is certainly due: But, in forming a judgment of the true date of the first sketch of *Romeo and Juliet*, we must couple both those remarkable circumstances together; the recollection of the earthquake; and the imitations from *Rosamond*; which, taken together, lead us to the spring-time of the year 1592, as the epoch of the first sketch.

Shakspeare resumed the consideration of this Drama, in 1595, when deficiencies were supplied, whatever redundancies may have been taken away. There is a remark of *Romeo*,

meo,

meo, which points, probably, to the voyages of Drake, and of Hawkins, in the American Seas, during the years 1594, and 1595; perhaps, to the voyage of Raleigh, in 1595:

“ I am no Pilot (*h*); yet, wert thou as far,

“ As that *vast shore*, wash'd with the farthest sea,

“ I would adventure for such *merchandize*.”

There is a mention, in the *third* act, of “ *the first and second cause*,” that was probably adopted from Saviolo's treatise, on *honour and honourable quarrels*, which was published, in 1595 (*i*).

Romeo and Juliet was, originally, acted by the servants of Lord Hunsden, the Lord Chamberlain, who died, in July 1590: This notice of the players, by whom this play was first acted, appears in the title page of the original edition, in 1597 (*k*). The inaccuracies of the Arithmetic of the garrulous nurse, who by one computation makes Ju-

(*h*) Camden, in Kennet, vol. ii. p. 579-85: It is to be recollected, that the word, *Pilot*, signified, in that age, *navigator*.

(*i*) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 518.

(*k*) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 518.

liet eleven years old, and by another fourteen, only show, that Shakspeare had composed his play at different times, when his attention was drawn away by dissimilar objects.

No. IV.—HENRY VI.

The First Part, 1593.

I have the honour to concur with Mr. Malone, in thinking, that this *historie* was not written by Shakspeare. It is still more clear, both from the account books of Henflow, and the plain intimations of the original Editors of Shakspeare's Dramas, Hemmings, and Cundal, who perfectly knew the transactions of their own theatre, that our Poet might have made such alterations, and additions, in this early play, as to have induced them, to mingle such mean materials with his finest metal.

The play of Henry the VI. was first acted by Lord Strange's players, on the 3d of March 1591-2; and it was ere long acted thirteen times, before ten thousand spectators; so popular was this *Historie*, however

it

it may have been despised, in latter times. For this popular reception, Whetstones appears to have prepared the way, by saying in his *English Myrror* (1): “ By far larger
 “ warrant, the English Kings ought to be
 “ called Henries: For, of eight Kings
 “ named Henry, sithens the conquest, chro-
 “ nicles condemn not one of them to be ir-
 “ religious, notably wicked, or tyrannous
 “ oppressors of their subjects, but as images
 “ and patterns of kingly magnanimitie, of
 “ wonderful promise, of peaceable govern-
 “ ment, and of many other divine and he-
 “ roical virtues, every of them have left
 “ a rare monument of a noble, gracious,
 “ and good prince, as if by heavenly pro-
 “ vidence, an especial blessing had been
 “ joined unto the name of Henry.” Whether all these assertions could be satisfactorily supported, if they were rigorously scanned, I doubt: But, it can admit of no doubt,

(1) The *English Myrror*; by George Whetstones, Gent. Printed by Windet, in 1586, six years before the first appearance of Henry 6th. This writer is sometimes called Whetstone.

whether such recitals would have a powerful effect, among an uninformed people, who had not been yet accustomed to free discussion. It was said, also, by Nash (*m*), in 1592, and it may have had a powerful effect on English audiences, "That the
 " substance of all plays, is borrowed out of
 " our English Chronicles, wherein our fore-
 " fathers valiant acts are reviewed; and
 " they themselves raised from the grave of
 " oblivion and brought to plead their aged
 " honours in open presence." It is even said, by the commentators, with sufficient reason, that one of the characters, in *Henrie the VI.* is "brave *Talbot*, the terror of the
 " French (*n*)."
 On the contrary, Ben Jonson, with a peculiar repugnance to every thing, which was properly popular, tried, with little success, to ridicule the historical

(*m*) In *Pierce Pennyleffe his Supplication to the Devil*, which was entered in the Stationers Registers, on the 8th August 1592; and soon after published.

(*n*) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 490.

plays

plays of that age, in the Epilogue to his *Every Man in his Humour*, 1598:

"Fight over York and Lancaster's long jars;

"And, in the tying house, bring wounds to scars."

No. V.—HENRY VI.

The Second Part, 1595.

I also concur with Mr. Malone, in thinking, that Shakspeare, as he merely improved the first part of Henry VI. by slight alterations, and certainly adopted into the third part the whole of a preceding play, may have equally adopted, for his second part, a preceding play, entitled, *The first Part of the Contention of the two famous Houses of Yorke and Lancaster*. This play was entered in the Stationers Registers, on the 12th of March, 1593-4: Yet, the earliest copy, which the collectors have hitherto seen, was printed, in 1600: Nevertheless, I think it probable, that this play may have been published by Millington, in 8vo. or 12mo. during the year 1595; because it is certain, that the same bookseller did publish, *The True Tragedy of Richard, Duke of Yorke*, in a 12mo. form, during 1595. This probability

would show, that our poet fitted for the stage both those Dramas, which now form the *second* and *third* parts of Henry VI, subsequent to that year. Neither Mr. Steevens, nor Mr. Malone, seem to have known, that the first, and second, parts of Henry VI were ever entered in the Stationers Registers; which, however, do exhibit their entry together, on the 19th of April, 1602.

No. VI.—HENRY VI.

The Third Part.

The years 1593, and 1594, are assigned, by the commentators, as the true epochs of the writing of this Historie; being copied from a previous play of Marlow, entitled *The true Tragedy of Richard Duke of Yorke*, which they say was first published in 1600. There are passages in this *True Tragedy* of sufficient splendour to justify what has been said of Marlow's *mighty line*. But, it is not likely, that Shakspeare would copy from a play, which he probably had not then seen. Yet, is it demonstrable, that Shakspeare may have seen the *True Tragedy of Richard, Duke of Yorke*, in 1595, which

was

was printed, in this year, certainly (o). From this prior Drama, Shakspeare, literally, copied, in many scenes, the third part of Henry VI; as may be distinctly seen by inspection:

MARLOW began his Historie thus:

War. I wonder how the King escapt our hands.

Yorke. Whilst we pursude the horsemen of the North,
He flieilie stole awaie and left his men;
Whereat the great Lord of Northumberland,
Whose warlike ears could never brook retreat,
Chargete our maine battels front, therewith him
Lord Stafford and Lord Clifford all abreast
Brake in, and were by the hands of common Soldiers
slain.

(o) This very rare book, which neither Mr. Capel, nor Mr. Malone, nor Mr. Steevens, nor Mr. Herbert, nor Mr. John Egerton, appear to have ever seen, is in my Library. This play, which I purchased at the sale of the late Rev. Dr. Pegge's books, is entitled "The True Tragedie of Richard Duke of Yorke, and the death of good King Henrie the Sixt, with the whole Contention betweene the two Houses Lancaster and Yorke, as it was sundrie times acted by the Right Honourable the Earle of Pembroke his Servants." Printed at London by P. S. for Thomas Millington, and are to be sold at his Shoppe under Saint Peter's church in Cornwall. [Cornhill.] 1595. 12mo.

SHAKSPEARE began his Historie thus :

War. I wonder, how the King escap'd our hands.

Yorke. While we pursu'd the horsemen of the North,
He flyly stole away, and left his men :
Whereat the great Lord of Northumberland,
Whose warlike ears could never brook retreat,
Cheer'd up the drooping Army; and himself,
Lord Clifford, and Lord Stafford, all abreast,
Charg'd our main battel's front, and breaking in,
Were by the *swords* of common soldiers slain.

We see by this comparison, the similitude of both, and the improvements of Shakspeare, by slight additions. Take another example, from the first act :

MARLOW :

King. Looke Lordings where the sturdy rebell sits
Even in the Chair of State: belike he means,
Backt by the power of Warwicke, that false peer,
To aspire unto the Crown, and raigne as King.
Earl of Northumberland, he slew thy father,
And thine, Lord Clifford: and you both have vow'd
revenge
On him, his Sonnes, his favourites, and his friends.

SHAKSPEARE :

King Hen. *My Lords,* look where the sturdy rebel sits,
Even in the Chair of State ! belike he means
(Back'd by the power of Warwicke, that false peer)
To aspire unto the Crown, and reign as King.

Earl

Earl of Northumberland, he slew thy father ;
And thine, Lord Clifford ; and you both vow'd revenge,
On him, his sons, his favourites, and his friends.

MARLOW :

Edw. *Et tu Brute, wilt thou stab Cæsar too ?*
A parle Sirra to George of Clarence.

SHAKSPEARE

Dismissed the classical talk of *tu Brute* ; and only
added, a parley is founded.

MARLOW :

Alarms, and then, enter Warwicke wounded.

Warw. Ah, who is nie ? Come to me friend, or foe,
And tell me, who is victor York or Warwick ?
Why ask I that ? my mangl'd bodie shews,
That I must yield my bodie to the earth.
And by my fall the conquest to my foes.
Thus yields the Cedar to the axes edge.
Whose arms gave shelter to the princely Eagle,
Under whose shade the rampant lion slept,
Whose top branch overpeer'd Jove's spreading tree.
The wrinkles in my brows now fil'd with blood,
Were liken'd oft to kingly Sepulchres.
For who liv'd King, but I could dig his grave ?
And who durst smile, when Warwick bent his brow ?
Lo now my glory smeer'd in dust and blood
My parks, my walkes, my manners that I had,
Even now forsake me, and of all my lands,
Is nothing left me but my bodies length.

U 4

SHAKSPEARE.

SHAKSPEARE:

*Alarum: Enter Edward, bring forth Warwick wounded.**King Edw.* So, lie thou there: die thou, and die our fear:

For, Warwick was a bug, that fear'd us all.
 Now, Montague sit fast; I seek for thee,
 That Warwick's bones may keep thee company. [*Exit.*]

Warw. Ah, who is nigh, come to me friend, or foe,
 And tell me who is victor, York, or Warwick.
 Why ask I that? my mangled body shows,
My blood, my want of strength, my sick heart shows,
 That I must yield my body to the earth;
 And by my fall the conquest to my foe.
 Thus yields the Cedar to the axe's edge,
 Whose arms gave shelter to the princely eagle,
 Under whose shade the ramping lion slept;
 Whose top branch overpeer'd Jove's spreading tree,
And kept low shrubs from Winter's powerful wind.
These eyes, that now are dimm'd with Death's black veil,
Have been as piercing as the mid day sun,
To search the secret treasons of the world:
 The wrinkles in my brows, now filled with blood,
 Were liken'd oft to kingly Sepulchres;
 For, who liv'd King, but I could dig his grave?
 Lo! now my glory smear'd in dust and blood;
 My parks, my walks, my manors that I had,
 Even now forsake me; and of all my lands,
 Is nothing left me, but my body's length!
Why, what is pomp, rule, reign, but earth and dust?
And, live we how we can, yet die we must.

It

It is not often, that such an opportunity has occurred of comparing the original play, with Shakspeare's copy; the first sketch, with Shakspeare's improvements; the defects of the author, with the supplements of the copyist.

Mr. Capel has quoted two lines from Shakspeare's Henry VI:

"What will the aspiring blood of Lancaster

"Sink in the ground? I thought it would have mounted;"

in order to show, that he, who cannot discern the pen, that wrote them, ought never to pretend to discernment hereafter. The two lines above quoted, says Mr. Malone, in refutation of Capel's dogmatism, are found in Marlow's *True Tragedie of Richard, Duke of Yorke*. A comparison of the two poets will evince, that Mr. Capel is totally wrong; and that Mr. Malone is not altogether right:

MARLOW.

Gloſ. What? will the aspiring blood of Lancaster
Sinke into the ground, I *had* thought it would have
mounted.

See how my sword weeps for the poor King's death.

Now maie such purple teares be alwaies shed,

For

For such as seek the downfall of our house.
 If anie spark of life remain in thee, [Stab him again.
 Downe, downe to hell, and saie I sent thee thither.
 I that have neither pitie, love, nor feare.
 Indeed 'twas true, that Henry told me of;
 For, I have often heard my mother saie,
 That I came into the world with my legs forward,
 And had I not reason think you to make haste,
 And seek their ruins that usurp our rights?
 The women wept and the midwife cride,
 O Jesus blefs us, he is born with teeth.

SHAKSPEARE.

Gloſ. What, will the aspiring blood of Lancaster
 Sink in the ground? I thought, it would have mounted.
 See, how my sword weeps, for the poor King's death!
 O, may such purple tears be always shed
 From those who wish the downfall of our house!
 If any spark of life be yet remaining,
 Down, down to Hell, and say, I sent thee thither,
 [Stabs him again.

I that have neither pity, love, nor fear.
 Indeed, 'tis true, that Henry told me of;
 For, I have often heard my mother say,
 I came into the world with my legs forward:
 Had I not reason, think ye, to make haste,
 And seek their ruin, that usurp'd our right?
 The midwife wonder'd; and the women cry'd,
 O, Jesus blefs us, he is born with teeth.

From these comparisons, we may see the
 clouds of Capel evanish, before the effulgent
 light

light of the fact. I concur with Mr. Malone, in saying, that the third part of the *Historie* of Henry VI. was not written by Shakspeare; though the outline of it received some additional touches from our poet's pencil: And, with Mr. Malone, I think it more than probable, that Shakspeare also adopted the second, and third parts, of the *historie* of the same monarch, from the feebler plays of inferior dramatists; but not with *great* additions; as that chronologist asserts, without authority.

I do not concur, however, with the commentators, in thinking, that Shakspeare adopted the third, and second parts, of Henry VI. in 1593, or 1594 (*p*). For, there is positive evidence, that he must have adopted both, towards the end of the subsequent year, 1595; unless we could suppose, indeed, that the playhouse copies had been laid before him, for his correction: But, the title page of Marlow's *True Tragedie* proves, that it had been sundry times acted

(*p*) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 496.

by

by the servants of the Earl of *Pembrooke*, who was not the Lord Chamberlain, in 1595, and 1594. Green, who is supposed to have been the author of one of those prior plays, died in September, 1592; and Marlow, in May, 1593. Of these two contemporaries of Shakspeare, Gabriel Hervey remarked, in his *New Letter of notable Contents*, 1593, "Though Green were a *Julian*, " and Marlow a *Lucian*, they might admonish other to advise themselves." After considering all circumstances; what went before, as well as what followed; I am of opinion, that the epoch of the third part of Henry VI. ought to be 1595.

No. VII.—THE TWO GENTLEMEN OF
VERONA, 1595.

This comedy bears the same marks of an early production, as the *Love's Labours Lost*, *The Midsummer's Night Dream*, and *The Comedy of Errors*. It was originally assigned to the year, 1593 (q): It has been since

(q) Steev. Shak. 1778, vol. i. p. 285.

given,

given, to 1595, with better reason; though not with satisfactory proofs. This comedy was certainly written before September, 1598; when it was mentioned by Meres, in his *Wit's Treasury*.

The principal reason, for allowing the year, 1595, the honour of this comedy, by the commentators, is, that it alludes to the voyages of Gilbert, in 1594, and Raleigh, in 1595: Speaking of the youth of England, at that epoch, the poet says:

"Some to the wars, to try their fortunes there;

"Some to discover islands far away."

The Commentators had done better to have referred to the voyage of Hawkins, in 1594, when he passed the streights of Magellan; and to the expedition of Lancaster, in the same year, who sacked Fernambucca, in the Brazils (*r*).

There are, in act the third, some obvious allusions to Spenser's Sonnets of the year 1595: Of Sylvia, Proteus says:

"You must lay *lime*, to tangle her desires,

(*r*) Camden in Kennet, vol. ii. p. 579.

"By

" By *wailful Sonnets*, whose composed rhimes
 " Should be full fraught with serviceable vows."

The DUKE replies :

" Ay; much [is] the force of heaven-bred poesie!" (s)

Add to these considerations, the warlike state of England, in 1595, and the hostile tumults in Ireland, during the years 1594, and 1595. There was then a rebellion in Ireland; there were preparations made to resist the Spanish invasion, and to assist the French, in 1595: And it was to those warlike events, that Shakspeare referred, when he said the people of England

" Put their Sons to seek preferment out;

" Some to the wars, to try their fortunes there."

I know not, whether there be in these lines, some allusion to a remarkable transaction, in 1594: Sir Nicholas Clifford, and Sir Anthony Shirley, two *young* knights, behaved so bravely, under the French king, that he gave them the Order of St. Michael; by wearing which in the city, and the court, they gave offence to Elizabeth, who sent them to prison for their presumption: But, as they

(s) Steev. 1793, vol. iii. p. 247.

erred out of ignorance, in accepting such distinctions from a foreign prince, without her consent, she released them from imprisonment; obliging them, nevertheless, to resign their honours, and to send back their insignia (1). Now, the obvious allusion to Spenser's Sonnets, in 1595, seems to settle the epoch of *The two Gentlemen of Verona* to that remarkable year.

NO. VIII.—RICHARD III. 1595.

Shakspeare had received so many hints from the perusal of Marlow's *True Tragedie*, and such strong impressions, from the developement, therein, of the character of Gloucester; that he was induced, immediately, to continue the *Historie* of Richard the third. It is probable, that our great dramatist may have been somewhat emulous of the previous fame of Marlow; of those scenes, which had merited the eulogy of Jonson, when he talked of *Marlow's mighty line*. Certain it is, that when we open Shakspeare's Richard

(1) See Camden's An. in Kennet, 2 vol. p. 579.

the third, we seem to mount from the uniform flat, wherein we had been travelling, with uncheered steps, to an exalted eminence, from whence we behold around us, an extensive country, diversified by hill and dale, refreshed by many waters, and traversed by roads, leading to hospitable mansions:

Glof. Now, is the Winter of our discontent
Made glorious Summer by this Sun of York;
And all the Clouds, that lowr'd upon our house,
In the deep bosom of the ocean, bury'd.

Shakspeare had, probably, heard that this story had been already "acted in St. John's, Cambridge, so essentially, that had the tyrant of Phalaris beheld his bloody proceedings, it had mollified his heart:" He, certainly, knew, that an *Enterlude* entitled the *Tragedie of Richard the third*, had been exhibited, in 1593, or 1594. In fact, there was entered in the Stationers' Registers, on the 19th of June, 1594, "An Enterlude, intituled the Tragedie of Richard the third, wherein is shewn the death of Edward the fourth, with the smothering
" of

“ of the two princes in the Tower, with the
 “ lamentable end of Shore’s wife, and the
 “ contention of the two houses of Lancas-
 “ ter and Yorke (u).” Shakspeare’s own
 Tragedie of Richard the third, with the
 death of the Duke of Clarence, was en-
 tered in the same Registers, on the 20th of
 October, 1597; and it was published, in the
 same year (x): But, it must have been previously
 acted, and written, before it was published:
 Now, those considerations, when compared
 with the subsequent productions of the same
 poet, fix the true epoch of Richard the third,
 in 1595, and not in 1597.

Whether it were, that the *Sun of Yorke*
 began to dispel the clouds of Lancaster,
 which had so long enveloped truth, in win-

(u) Steev. Shak. 1793, vol. x. p. 700-1. In estimat-
 ing those probabilities, we ought to take into the ac-
 count, that Churchyard published his *Challenge*, in
 1593, which comprehends “ the Tragedie of Shore’s
 “ Wife, much augmented, with divers new additions.”
 This *Legend* was extremely popular, owing to its sim-
 plicity, and moral; and by it Churchyard gained just
 celebration.

(x) Steev. Shak. 1793, vol. i. p. 427.

ter's gloom, the accession of King James, when *grim-visag'd war smoothed his wrinkled front*, appears clearly to have set free several pens, that gave new lustre to history. Sir George Buc, who was an antiquary, took the lead, in exhibiting juster views of Richard's story, than the scenic representations of Shakspeare had given, from the "little understanding" chroniclers: Yet, the life of Richard by Sir George Buc, was not published till 1647; though the original draught of it had been, happily, preserved by Sir Robert Cotton. Sir William Cornewallis, the younger, published, in 1616, an Essay, in *The Praise of King Richard the third*. The essayist seems to have lamented Richard's fate, and to have disdained the obloquy, which was daily cast up on his fame: "Neither can his blood," said Cornewallis, "redeem him from injurious tongues, nor the reproach offered his body be thought cruel enough, but that we must make him more cruelly infamous, in *pamphlets*, and *playes*." The late Lord Orford seems not to have known, that he had had a precursor,

cursor, in the office of apologist, in Sir Edward Cornewallis; who wrote with equal research, and more learning, than himself.

Neither do the commentators seem to have known, that the "much writing" Heywood wrote a play, upon the same subject; as Shakspeare had before followed his predecessors, over this fruitful field. Heywood has left a *prologue*, which "was spoken by
" a young witty lad, playing the part of
" Richard the third, at the Red Bull :"

" If any wonder by what magick charme,

" Richard the Third is thrunk up, like his arme:

" And, where in falnesse you expected him,

" You see me only crawling, like a limme,

" Or piece of that *knowne* *fabrick*, and no more,

" When *he* so often hath been view'd before." (y)

(y) See Heywood's *Pleasant Dialogues and Dramas*, 1637, p. 247. It is herein said " That the Author, " because *he* was interested in the play, wrote him this " Prologue, and Epilogue." I do not see this Richard of Thomas Heywood noticed in any of the scenic registers.

No. IX.—RICHARD II. 1596.

This *Historie* was entered in the Stationers' Registers, on the 29th of August, 1597; and printed in the same year: It was recognized as Shakspeare's, by Meres, in his *Wit's Treasury*, during the year 1598.

Like other dramas of this great poet, this *Historie* was suggested to so observant a spirit, by a former play, on the same subject; though it had not Shakspeare's adaptation to the time, nor his proprieties of place, and circumstance.

There is an intimation of time towards the conclusion of the first act, which points directly to the true epoch of it's composition:

Green. Now for the rebels, which stand out in Ireland:

Expedient manage must be made, my liege,
Ere further leisure yield them further means,
For their advantage, and your highness' loss.

K. Rich. We will ourself in person to this war.

In the Second Act, *Bushy* remarks:
The Wind fits fair, for news to go to Ireland;
But, none returns. For us to levy power,
Proportionable to the Enemy,
Is all impossible.

The

The rebellion in Ireland, which was renewed, in 1594, was proclaimed, in 1595, both in Ireland, and in England; and underwent EXPEDIENT (z) *manage*, in 1596. It follows, then, from these facts, if it were the uniform practice of Shakspeare to catch at contemporary circumstances, for amusing his audiences, that those strong remarks, on the state of Ireland, in 1594, and in 1595, when Tir Owen took the Queen's Fort, at Blackwater, making at the same time, many professions of his *invariable loyalty* (a), fix with sufficient certainty the writing of Richard II. to 1596. It ought to be remembered, to the honour of Shakspeare, that he laid his satirical finger upon the weak, temporizing, shifting, policy of Elizabeth, which gave every possible encouragement to the rebels; and which afforded unprincipled traitors *further leisure*; and yielded them *further means*, for *their advantage*, and *her highness' loss*. When to those striking allu-

(z) Camden in Ken. vol. ii. 581—587—589. (b)

(a) Ib. 587. (c)

sions, is added the concatenation of our poet's plan, in those historical plays, it must become apparent to every judicious eye, that Richard II. was written in 1596; and not in 1597, as the editors have supposed, on weaker grounds.

After some contrariety of opinion (b), and some hesitation of judgment, the commentators seem to have finally settled their conviction, "that there had been a former play
 " on this subject, which appears to have
 " been called King Henry IV, in which
 " Richard was deposed, and killed on the
 " stage (c)." But, none of the collectors of old plays have ever found such a drama; nor had Farmer, nor Tyrwhit, whose authority for *the fact* is chiefly relied on, ever seen such a play: These Critics, whatever weight may be due to their judgements, merely quote the acting of an old play on this subject, by the procurement of Merrick, and other partizans of the rebel, Earl of Essex, on the

(b) Steev. Shak. 1778, vol. i. p. 296.

(c) Steev. 1790, vol. i. p. 533.

7th of February, 1600-1: On the trial of Merrick, for high treason, it was given in evidence, among other treasonable facts, " That the afternoon before the rebellion, " Merrick, with a great company of others, " that afterwards were all in the action, had " procured to be played before them, *the* " *Play of deposing Richard II*; neither was " it casual, but a play, bespoken by Merrick; " and not only so, but when it was told him " by one of the players, *that the play was* " *old*, and they should have loss in playing " it, because few would come to it, there " was fourty shillings extraordinary given " to play it; and so thereupon played it " was (*d*).” In opposition to Farmer, and Tyrwhit, I hold, though I have a great respect for their memories, that it was illogical to argue, from a nonentity, against an

(*d*) I quote from “ The Declaration of the Practises “ and Treasons attempted and committed by Robert “ late Earl of Essex and his Complices against her Majesty and her Kingdoms, &c.” which was printed by Barker, the Queen’s Printer, in 1601; and which is supposed to have been drawn by Sir Francis Bacon.

entity; that as no such play as the Henry IV, which they spoke of, had ever appeared, while Shakspeare's Richard II was apparent to every eye, it was in consequential reasoning, in them, to prefer the first play to the last: And, I am, therefore, of opinion, that *the play of deposing Richard II*, which was seditiously, played, on the 7th of February 1600-1, was Shakspeare's Richard II, that had been originally acted, in 1596, and first printed, in 1597.

The acting of this play of *the deposing of Richard II*. sunk deep into the heart of Queen Elizabeth. This treasonable insult, she never forgave, nor forgot. She spoke, feelingly, of it to old William Lambard, when he presented to her his *Pandecta Re-tulorum*; adding, though I know not upon what information, “that this tragedy was
“ played forty times in open streets, and
“ houses (e).”

It

(e) See in Nicols's curious Collection of Queen Elizabeth's Progresses, vol. ii. “That which passed from
“ the Excellent Majestie of Queen Elizabeth, in her
“ Privie

It is true, indeed, that Haywarde, published, in 1599, very imprudently, "The first part of the life and raigne of King Henrie iii; extending to the end of the first yeare of his raigne," which he still more imprudently dedicated, in very encomiastic terms, to the Earl of Essex; whether with the seditious purpose of Merri-
 cke, I will not suppose. Certain it is, that Elizabeth was highly irritated against the author. And she employed Sir Francis Bacon to search the book for treason. But, from a charge, which involved in it the penalty of death, he saved Haywarde, by a joke; though not from a censure in the Star Chamber, as his seditious, or his sycophantic, purpose, well deserved. Haywarde pursued the same studies; published similar histories; and was knighted by King James.

"Privie Chamber at East Greenwich, 4 Augusti, 1601, 43 reg. sui, towards William Lambarde."—Whether the *Pandecta Rotulorum* of Lambard were ever printed, as I formerly supposed, I now doubt,

The

The Lord Chancellor Ellesmere, in deciding the case of the *Post nati*, pronounced a severe censure on the writers of the *life*, and *reign*, of the unhappy Son of the illustrious Prince of Wales; "I will not remember, said that experienced Judge, Richard the Second's time (of which some of our chroniclers do talk idly, and understand little) where power and might of some potent persons oppressed justice and faithful judges, for expounding the law foundly and truly (*f*)."

Whether Haywarde were included, in the Lord Chancellor's animadversions, cannot now be discovered; but, probability leads us to suppose, that censure, will generally follow demerit, as a proper retribution.

In the 5th act of Henry IV, there are intimations of what might be expected of the Prince and his *loose companions*, in the dramas, which came after it. Boling-

(*f*) The speech of the Lord Chancellor of England, in the Exchequer Chamber, touching the *Post nati*, Printed 1609, p. 18.

broke, Percy, and other Lords being at Windsor Castle, the father naturally asks:

Bol. Can no man tell of my unthrifty Son?
Tis full three months since I did see him last:
Enquire at London 'mongst the Taverns there:
For, there, they say, he doth frequent,
With unrestrained loose companions;
Even such, they say, as stand in narrow lanes,
And beat our watch, and rob our passengers.

Percy. My Lord, some two days since, I saw the Prince;
And told him of these triumphs held at Oxford.

Bol. And what said the Gallant?

Percy. His answer was, He would unto the stews;
And from the commonest creature pluck a glove,
And wear it as a favour; and with that
He would unhorse the lustiest Challenger.

Bol. As dissolute, as desperate; yet, through both,
I see some sparkles of a better hope,
Which older days may happily bring forth.

In these sketches, we may perceive the workings of the poet's mind, which had drawn an outline, that was to be filled up, and finished, in several subsequent dramatical histories.

No. X.—THE MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR,
1596.

The epoch of the production of this fine Comedy has hitherto been fixed, in 1601, though the reasons, which have been assigned, for thus fixing it, would rather place it, at some earlier period (*g*).

It is a fact, which cannot be contradicted, that this play was merely a sketch, when it was first represented; and was afterwards, altered, and expanded, when it was, in a subsequent reign, produced, as it at present stands. It was revised, enlarged, and amended, after the accession of King James, say the Commentators (*h*).

There are many allusions, in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, which show, that it was originally sketched, in 1596, during the town talk about the return of Raleigh, and the publication of his lying narrative, concerning the discovery of *El Dorado*. There

(*g*) Steev. Shak. 1778, vol. i. p. 307:—Steev. Shak. 1793, vol. i. p. 548.

(*h*) Steev. Shak. 1793, vol. i. p. 549.

are several metaphors, in this Comedy, which were fetched from the sea, from ships, and from sea affairs; and which seem to be unsuitable to the inhabitants of an inland town, like Windsor: But, the talk of the times turned on transmarine adventures. Of Ford's Wife, Sir John Falstaff says "She bears the purse too; " she is a region in Guiana, all gold and " bounty:" and, after sneering thus at Raleigh's *El Dorado*, Falstaff adds, with regard to Mrs. Ford, and Mrs. Page, "I " will be cheater to them both, and they " shall be exchequers to me; they shall " be my East, and West Indies; and I " will trade to them both:" Delivering his Epistles, for the *Merry Wives*, to his page, Sir John directs him—

" ——— to bear these letters tightly;

" Sail, like my pinnace, to these golden shores."

This line, which was in the first sketch of the *Merry Wives of Windsor*, shows, that it was written, say the Commentators, after Sir Walter Raleigh returned from Guiana, in 1596 (i).

(i) Steev. Ed. 1793, vol. i. p. 548.

But,

But, there is another note of time, which the Commentators have not remarked, although it is still more indicative of the date of this play. The *Fairy Queen* is often alluded to; and is mentioned, in the fourth act, particularly. The whole plot, which was laid by Mrs. Page, to be executed at the hour of *fairy revel*, around Herne's Oak by *urchins, ouches, and fairies*, green, and white, was plainly an allusion to the *Fairy Queen* of 1596; which, for some time, after its publication, was the universal talk of the time. In forming her plot, Mrs. Page adjusted, that,

“ My Nan shall be the *Queen* of all the *fairies*

“ Finely attired, in a robe of white.”

In the 5th act, *Nan*, and her troop of *Fairies*, attend their several offices, as the moonshine revellers. Sir Hugh, with an encomiastic allusion, to Elizabeth, the *Faery Queen*, herself, remarks:

“ Our radiant Queen hates futs, and sluttery.”

To all those striking intimations, let us add the obvious recollections of Lodge's *Devils Incarnate*, 1596, wherein he ridicules

cules the *lecherous race of Devils Incarnate*, in our age (*k*). This *lecherous race* is exposed to ineffable ridicule, by the example of Sir John's courtship of the *Merry Wives*; When Falstaff saw them at Herne's Oak, he cries out, in the very language of the *Devil Luxury*: "Let the Sky rain *potatoes*; "let it thunder to the tune of Green "Sleeves; hail kissing comfits; and snow "eringoes: Let there come a tempest of "provocation." For this profanation, Sir John, who, according to Sir Hugh, "is "full of *lecheries*, and iniquity," is pinched by the *faeries*, who sing a scornful rhyme:

"Fie on sinful fantasy!
 "Fie on lust, and luxury!
 "Lust is but a bloody fire
 "Kindled with unchaste desire."

(*k*) See p. 45—46—50: Shakspeare may have had one eye on Lodge, as above; and the other eye on Holingshed, who describes a similar shower, as Mr. Steevens has shown: [Shak. 1793, vol. iii. p. 482.] Shakspeare made use of two words, which are in Lodge, but not in Holingshed: Let it rain *potatoes*: and snow *eringoes*.

Such

Such are the reasons, which convince me, that the first sketch of the Merry Wives of Windsor, was drawn, in 1596, and not in 1601.

Whether this Comedy were written by the command of Queen Elizabeth, as babbling tradition has said, and as the Commentators have as confidently repeated, as if the story had been recorded for a certainty, I think there is sufficient reason to doubt. She was certainly too feeble in 1601, to think of such toys; and she was perhaps too busy, in 1596. It is said, however, by the Commentators (1), that Falstaff talks, in the Merry Wives of Windsor, as if he were still in favour at Court; "*if it should come to the ear of the Court how I have been transformed:*" But, this passage, I have not found: I see, indeed, in the first sketch, that Sir John, after he had been exposed at Herne's Oak, remarks,

"Well; if the fine wits of the Court hear this,

(1) Steev. Shak. Ed. 1793, vol. i. p. 548.

"They'l

"They'l so whip me with their keen jests,
 "That they'l melt me out like tallow (m)."

It is, moreover, said, though I have not found the passage, that Page discountenances Fenton's addresses to his daughter; "*because he kept company with the wild Prince, and with Poyntz.*" Fenton does, indeed, tell Mistress Anne, that her father had objected, "*my riots past, my wild societies:*" (n) But, nothing is said of the Prince, or Poyntz. After the tormenting faeries ran away, and a noise of hunting is heard, Sir John cries out: "What; hunting at this time at night! I'll lay my life, the *mad Prince of Wales* is stealing his father's deer!" (o) On the whole, it is sufficiently apparent, that the first sketch of this charming comedy was extremely imperfect, and the first printed copy of it was still more defective: Nothing can be more silly than this joke of Falstaff's about

(m) Steev. Ed. 1766. H. 2. This passage seems to have been left out of the improved Edition.

(n) Steev. 1793, vol. iii. p. 428.

(o) Steev. Ed. 1766, Sig. H. 2.

the *mad Prince stealing his father's deer*. On such an occasion, Sir John could not have been such a *blunt witted knight*. And, we see nothing of this impertinent interpolation, in the improved edition, which, originally, appeared in the first folio.

The precise time, "when the alterations, " and additions, were made, has not been " ascertained," say the commentators (p). It was certainly altered, and amended, after the accession of James I. because, the king is expressly mentioned in the first scene. There is also emphatical talk about *the knights*, in allusion, as the commentators think, to the numbers, which were made by that monarch, on his journey from Scotland. Mistress Quickly tattles about the *coaches*, which came to the installation; and this leads the commentators to tell, how coaches did not come into *general use* till the year 1605 (q). But, I have formerly shown, from the Journals of Parliament, that a bill was introduced, during

(f) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 549.

(q) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 550.

the session of 1601, "to restrain the excessive use of coaches (r)." What is said, by the commentators, about the *Cotswold games*, is too indefinite to ascertain a date (s). There is

(r) 1st Jour. 602.

(s) In the first act of the enlarged edition, Slender naturally asks Page, "How does your fallow greyhound, Sir? I hear he was outrun at *Cotfale*." Slender alluded to the games at Cotswold, in Gloucestershire, which are said to have been instituted by Robert Dover, an attorney, during the reign of James. Doctor Farmer doubts, whether Dover were not rather the *reviver* than the *founder* of these rural sports. Mr. Steevens agrees with Doctor Farmer. Mr. Malone adopts the opinion of Anthony Wood, that those manly games were instituted by Dover about the year 1603, with the leave of King James, and the encouragement of Endymion Porter. [Steev. 1793. vol. i. p. 551-2.] The fact, however, is, as we may learn from Rudder's History of Gloucestershire, [p. 23-4.] That, in more early times, there was at Cotswold a customary meeting, every year, at Whitsontide, called an *ale*, or *Whitsen-ale*, which was attended by all the lads, and the lasses, of the *villegery*, who, annually, chose a Lord and Lady of the *Yule*, who were the authorized rulers of the *rustic revellers*. There is in the Church of Cirencester, says Rudder, an ancient monument, in *bass-relievo*, that evinces the antiquity of those games,

is a note of time, however, that the commentators have overlooked, though it would have shewn them the year, which they searched for. I mean the statute (*t*), to restrain the abuses of players. This act was made, “for preventing the *great abuse* of “the *holy name of God*, in stage plays, entludes, May-games, shows, and such “like.” This prohibitory law compelled Shakspeare to soften down the character of Slender, who was a swaggerer, in the first

which were known to Shakspeare, before the accession of King James. They were known, also, to Drayton early in that reign: For upon the map of Gloucestershire, which precedes the *fourteenth song*, there is a representation of a *Whitsun-ale*, with a *maypole*, which last is inscribed, “*Heigh for Cotswold:*”

“Ascending, next, faire Cotswold’s plaines,

“She *revels* with the *Shepherds* swaines;

“And sends the daintie nymphes away,

“’Gainst Tame and Isis wedding day.”

[I quote from the *Poly-Olbion* of the year 1613. In addition to the *Annalia Dubrensia*, 1636, there is a copy of verses in D’Avenant’s Poems, 1638, “In celebration of the yearely preserver of the games at Cotswold.”]

(*t*) 3 Ja. i. ch. 21.

draught;

draught; and who swore, often, in the presence of Anne Page (*u*): But, in the improved play, "the abuse of the holy name " of God" is expunged. Slender no longer talks stoutly of *taking a bear by the muzzle*. And he is sweated down to a *simpleton*, who discovers, that Mistress Anne Page speaks small like a woman; who cannot distinguish a boy from a girl in the dark; and who protests, "if he had married the postmaster's boy, for all the boy was in woman's " apparel, he would not have had him." The statute, then, obliged Shakspeare to change the whole character of Slender, much for the better, from *Swaggerer* to *Simpleton*. These suggestions seem to fix the epoch of the alterations, and amendments, of this comedy, to 1606. On reading Falstaff's love letter, Mrs. Page exclaims: "Why I'll exhibit a Bill in Parliament, for the putting down of fat men(*x*)."

(*u*) Steev. Ed. 1766. Sign. E. 4.

(*x*) This parliament began the 5th of November 1605, and ended the 26th May 1606. 1 C. Journal of those dates.

This obvious sarcasm on the many bills, which were unadvisedly moved, in that Parliament, was not, probably, ventured till after the prorogation, on the 26th of May, 1606. On the whole, it is apparent, from those facts, and circumstances, that the commentators conjectured, erroneously, both with regard to the original sketch, when they fixed it, in 1601, and the amended drama, which they placed, in 1603.

No. XI.—HENRY IV.

The First Part, 1596.

This drama was mentioned by Meres, in 1598. It was, in fact, entered in the Stationers' Registers, on the 25th of February, 1597–8, and was printed, in 1598: And, from these facts, the commentators infer, that this play was written, in 1597.

There are other circumstances, however, which speak with stronger evidence, that the first part of Henry IV. was written, in 1596. The first scene opens with the King's reflections on his own health, and the state of the nation :

“ So

" So shaken as we are, so wan with care,
 " Find we a time for *frighted peace to pant*;
 " And breath short winded accents of *new broils*,
 " To be *commenced in stronds a far remote*."

This passage, plainly, alludes to the renewal of hostilities with Spain, in 1596; and to the failing, in June, of the expedition to Cadiz, from which place, Howard, and Essex, having sacked it, departed thence, on the 5th of July, 1596 (y).

Falstaff, when concerting a robbery, for *recreation-sake*, remarks, with a biting sneer, that " the poor abuses of the time want countenance." While the military preparations were making, in 1596, says Camden, " there were a parcel of loose fellows, " who went about the kingdom, under " the counterfeit authority of *the Queen's Pursuivants*, with sham warrants, taking " away, by force, plate, jewels, and what- " ever they could find." (z). That such abuses *of the time* should have existed under the wise reign of Elizabeth, and under the discreet administration of Burleigh, would

(y) Camden in Kennet, vol. ii. 592-3. (z) Ib. 595.

be incredible, if they were not related by Camden, and confirmed by incontrovertible evidence: There still remains a Proclamation, dated the 3d of May, 1596, "against
 " fundry abuses, practised by divers lewd
 " and audacious persons, falsley naming
 " themselves Messengers of Her Majesty's
 " Chamber, travelling from place to place,
 " with writings counterfeited, in form of
 " warrants; to the great slander of her
 " Majesty's service, and abuse of her loving
 " subjects." It appears, moreover, by the proclamation, that though divers of those audacious persons had, for such practices, been set in the pillorie, had lost their ears, and had been marked in the face, for their notable *abuses*; yet, such were the audacious dispositions of those most vile persons, says the proclamation, that they more and more continued this *notorious abuse*. Such, then, were the *poor abuses* of the time, which were ridiculed, by the sarcasms of Falstaff, in this play. When Prince Henry, laughing at Sir John, says, " I see a good
 " amendment of life in thee, from pray-
 ing

“ing to purse taking;” Falstaff cries out;
 “Why, Hall, ’tis my *vocation*, Hall! ’tis
 “no sin for a man to labour in his *voca-*
 “tion!” The satire is here, plainly, le-
 velled at the *Messengers* of the *Queen’s Cham-*
ber; the pursuivants; who, under pretence
 of authority, levied contributions on the
 people: And this satire must have been
 highly applauded, by the auditors, who had
 severely felt the grievance. Shakspeare
 may possibly have had in his mind, at the
 same time, Ratcliff’s *Politique Discourses*,
 of 1578, which gave the etymology and de-
 finition of the word *vocation*; as Dr. Far-
 mer remarked (a).

There are other allusions to the year,
 1596. The carriers lamenting, in act II.
 the death of Robin, the ostler, at Rochester,
 remark, that “the poor fellow never joy’d
 “since *the price of oats rose*; it was death
 “to him.” The price of grain rose to a
 very uncommon height, in 1596, “by co-
 “lour of the *unseasonableness of this som-*

(a) Steev. 1793. vol. viii. p. 380.

“mer:”

"mer:" And, on the last day of July, 1596, the Queen issued "*A Proclamation* for the "*Dearth of Corne,*" against ingrossers, and the makers of starch.

The impetuous Hotspur, grown impatient at the tediousness of Glendower, exclaims: He angers me, with telling—

" ——— Such a deal of skimble-skamble-stuff,
 " As puts me from my faith: I tell you what;
 " He held me, but last night, at least nine hours,
 " In reckoning up the several *devils names,*
 " That were his lackeys."

Here, again, is another stroke at the *Devils Incarnate* of Lodge, in 1596, which have all appropriate names. There are even allusions to the year preceding: To Daniel's *Civil Warres*, of 1595; and, to a collection entitled, *Wits, Fits, and Fancies*, of the same year: and, moreover, an allusion to the Letter of Amurah the Great Turk, to Christendom, in 1594 (b).

(b) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 537.

No. XII.—HENRY IV.

The Second Part, 1597.

The late Dr. Johnson has remarked,
“ That these two plays [Henry IV. the first
“ and second parts] will appear to every
“ reader, who shall peruse them, without
“ ambition of critical discoveries, to be so
“ connected, that the second is merely a
“ sequel to the first; to be two, only, be-
“ cause they are too long to be one (c).”
It was entered in the Stationers’ Registers,
on the 23d of August, 1600, and was
printed, in the same year. Ben Jonson,
certainly, alluded to the *Justice Silence* of
this play, in his *Every Man in his humour*,
which was first acted in 1599; but was pro-
bably written, in 1598, as the slowness,
and circumspection of Ben, are sufficiently
known.

No. XIII.—HENRY V. 1597.

This Chronicle Historie of Henry V. was
entered in the Stationers’ Registers, on the

(c) Mal. Shak. vol. v. 279.

14th of August, 1600; and was printed, though imperfectly, in the same year. It is evident, says Mr. Tyrwhit, that Shakspeare had formed the plan of Henry V. when he concluded his Henry IV; though it is, equally, apparent, that some time elapsed, and other objects intervened, before he finally executed his preconceived purpose: The *Epilogue* to Henry IV. told the audience, according to the theatrical practice of that age: “If you be not too
 “much cloyed with *fat meat*, our humble
 “author will continue the story with *Sir*
 “*John* in it, and make you merry with
 “fair Katherine of France; where [in the
 “play] for any thing I know, Falstaff
 “shall die of a sweat, unless already he be
 “killed with your hard opinions.”

There is, indeed, a note of time, in this dramatical *Historie*, which is so demonstrative of the epoch, when it was produced, as to be decisive of the fact. At the commencement of the 5th act, the *Chorus* enters, with an explanation of *the Story*, and due

due *course of things*: and desires the audience to " behold

" In the quick forge and working house of thought,
 " How London doth pour forth her citizens !
 " The Mayor, and all his brethren, in best sort,
 " Like to the Senators of antique Rome,
 " With the Plebeians, swarming at their heels,
 " Go forth, and fetch their conquering Cæsar in :
 " As by a lower but by loving likelihood,
 " Were *now* the General of our gracious Empress
 " (As in good time he may) from Ireland coming ;
 " Bringing rebellion broached on his sword,
 " How many would the peaceful city quit,
 " To welcom him ?"

Essex, *the general of our gracious Empress*, went to Ireland, say the Commentators, on the 15th of April, 1599; and returned to London, on the 28th of September of the same year(*d*). " About the end of March," says Camden (*e*), " the Earl of Essex set forward for Ireland, and was accompanied out of London with a fine appearance of nobility, and gentry, and the most cheerful huzzas of the common people."

(*d*) 5 Mal. Shak. 585.—Vol. i. 320.—1 Steev. 539.

(*e*) In Kennet, vol. ii. p. 614.

In fact, the Queen issued, on "the last day of March, 1599," her proclamation; "declaring her princely resolution, in sending "over of her army into the realm of Ireland." There was, at the same time, ordered a public *prayer*, "for the good "success of her Majesty's forces in Ireland." These facts prove, that the rebellion in Ireland, during the year 1599, the raising of a great army for its suppression, and the appointment of Essex, as Lord Deputy, and General, were brought, as striking objects, before the eyes of the people of England: The strong allusion of the *Chorus* must have been, therefore, received with popular applause.

Yet, it is more than probable, that this appropriate passage may have been interpolated, in April, 1599; in order, on the reproduction of this martial *Historie*, to gratify the temper of the times. It is a fact, which the theatrical books of Henslow prove, incontrovertibly, that the managers of the theatres, in the age of Shakspeare, were in the constant practice of employing
play-

play-wrights to alter, mend, and add to former plays: Rowley, Decker, Drayton, Heywood, Ben Jonson, and Massinger, were thus employed, to make frequent reparations of decayed structures (*f*). It is, moreover, a fact, that Shakspeare altered, and amended, his own dramas, and sometimes made *reparations* in the plays of contemporary dramatists. From all those facts arise the pro-

(*f*) See Mal. Shak. vol. i. p^t. ii. p. 308-325. On the 17th of August 1602, forty shillings were paid by Henslow to Decker "for new adycions to Owld-castell." Mr. Malone has the merit of having retrieved, and preserved, the account-books of Henslow, from which he has favoured the public with extracts. [Ib. 288-325.] The Editor has not, however, been always as happy in his conjectures, as he was lucky in retrieving those perishing MSS.; which MSS. show, that there was acted by the Lord Admerall's players, on the 11th of May, 1597, "The Comedy of *Humers*." This he conjectures to have been Ben Jonson's Every Man in his *humour*. [Ib. 299.] But, the *Humers* of Henslow was plainly Chapman's pleasant Comedy, entitled, *An Humorous Day's Myrth*; which had been sundry times acted by the Lord High Admiral, his servants; and which was published, in 1599: This specification precludes Mr. Malone's conjecture.

bability,

bability, that Shakspeare amended his *Historie* of Henry V; as new occurrences demanded suitable additions.

The first sketch of Henry V. was drawn, I believe, in the winter of the year 1597. The play opens with a conversation, between the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishop of Ely, which alludes to an occurrence of that period:

Cant. " My Lord, I'll tell you, that self bill is urg'd,
 " Which, in the eleventh year o' the last king's reign
 " Was like, and had indeed against us pass'd,
 " But, that the scrambling, and unquiet, time
 " Did push it out of further question.

Ely. " But, how, my Lord, shall we resist it now?

Cant. " It must be thought on: If it pass against us,
 " We lose the better half of our possession:
 " For all the temporal lands, which men devout,
 " By Testament, have given to the church,
 " Would they strip from us."

If it be true, as the commentators have admitted, and the fact demonstrates, that Shakspeare, like every other dramatist, both before, and after him, took advantage of the scenes of life, as they passed before him, to captivate the million, by allusions to familiar objects, it will follow as a strong probability,

bability, that Shakspeare alluded, in the opening of the first act, to the proceedings of the Parliament, in November, 1597. On the 14th of that month, it was remarked in the House of Commons, "That although
 " her Majestie had formerly been exceeding
 " unwilling, and opposite, to all manner of
 " innovations in ecclesiastical government;
 " yet, understanding at this parliament, of
 " divers great abuses therein, she not only
 " gave liberty to the House of Commons,
 " to treat thereof, but also encouraged them
 " to proceed in the reformation thereof, by
 " a message brought by Sir John Fortescue,
 " the Chancellor of the Exchequer." (g)
 On the 22d of the same November, the bill, for the relief of the poor out of *Impropriations*, and *other Church Livings*, was, after some speeches, rejected, on the question, for the commitment, on a division of one hundred and seventeen, to a hundred and forty six, votes (h). On the 23d of November, the bill, concerning leases, made by

(g) D'Ewes's Journ. p. 557. (h) Ib. 561.

archbishops and bishops, was, upon the second reading, also rejected (*i*). These passages must have attracted the public attention, owing to their accompanying circumstances, and been felt by the audiences of those times.

In this drama, there is much said, during the consultations against France; about the *intendment of the Scot*: And King Henry, wisely, observes:

“ We must not only arm to invade the French;
 “ But, lay down our proportions to defend
 “ Against the *Scot*, who will *make road upon us*,
 “ With all advantages.”

This applies, with more propriety, to the occurrences of 1597, than to the transactions

(*i*) Ib. 562: “ Thus runs the Bill;” says the Archbishop of Canterbury: “ This would drink deep; answers the Bishop of Ely: “ ’Twood drink the cup and “ all;” replies the Archbishop.—“ But my good “ Lord,” resumes the Bishop, “ How now for mitigation of this Bill, urged by the Commons? Doth his “ Majesty incline to it, or no?”—The Archbishop concludes: “ He seems indifferent, or rather, swaying “ more upon our part, than cherishing the exhibitors “ against us.” [Steev. Shak. vol. ix. p. 270-4.]

of

of 1599: For, in 1599, King James sent Elizabeth notice, that there were twelve thousand men preparing, in Spain, to land in Ireland (*k*): The entrance of the *Ambassadors of France* accords better with 1597, than with 1599. Add to all those circumstances, the palpable allusion to them; and it appears to my eye a *confirmation strong*, that Henry V was originally sketched, in 1597. In mistress Quickly's admirable account of the death of Falstaff, a conversation arose about what Sir John said, on his death bed:

Nym. " They say, he cried out of sack.

Quick. " Ay; that 'a did,

Bard. " And of women.

Quick. " Nay; that 'a did not.

Boy. " Yes; that 'a did; and said, they were *devils incarnate*."

The *Devils Incarnate* of Lodge, which was published, in 1596, appears never to have been out of Shakspeare's mind in 1597: An allusion to this striking publication would have, therefore, come too late, in 1599, to

(*k*) The Brit. Chronologist, vol. i. p. 174.

elevate, and surprise, an audience, whose minds are generally fixed on the passing time, without thinking on that, which is past. It was this consideration, which induced Shakspeare to introduce the *chorus*, speaking of the *Empress's General*, when he departed for Ireland, in April 1599; because the people's minds had been drawn to this subject by a *royal proclamation*, and a *public prayer*. It was that consideration, also, which induced Shakspeare, soon after the conference at Hampton Court, on the 14th of January, 1603-4 (1), to introduce a character of King James, that was out of place, if applied to Henry V: The Bishop of Ely, having remarked, "We are blessed in the
 " change of hydra-headed wilfulness," with an allusion to the reform of Henry V, this

(1) A pamphlet, containing the *sum* and *substance* of this conference, wherein King James acted as moderator, was published by the Rev. Dr. Barlow, the Dean of Chester, in 1604, 4to; by the direction of Archbishop Whitgift, who died before the publication of it.

observation

observation gave the Archbishop an occasion to remark :

- " Hear him but reason in Divinity,
- " And, all-admiring, with an inward wish,
- " You would desire, the King were made a Prelate :
- " Hear him debate of Commonwealth affairs,
- " You would say, it hath been all-in all his study :
- " List his discourse of War, and you shall hear
- " A fearful battle render'd you in musick :
- " Turn him to any cause of Policy,
- " The gordian knot of it he will unloose,
- " Familiar as his garter ; that, when he speaks,
- " The air, a charter'd libertine, is still."

This is a finished delineation of one part of King James's character, which clearly distinguishes his powers of *discourse*, from his faculties of action. Shakspeare, indeed, had penetrated into the whole character of King James ; as we shall see, in the sequel. But, such were the colloquial powers of the King, when he discoursed on *Divinity*, on *War*, or on *Policy*, that he imposed on that discerning minister, Sir Francis Walsingham ; who was sent by Elizabeth, to discover the real character of James, while he was yet young. I concur, then, with Warburton, in thinking, " that this scene was added

“ after King James’s accession to the throne.”

But, I do not concur, in the inference, which the same critic, immediately, draws, “ that
 “ we have no way of avoiding its being
 “ esteemed a compliment to *him*, but by
 “ supposing it a compliment to his *bishops*.”
 Warburton’s *impertinence* is not, however, approved by Doctor Johnson; who cannot conceive, “ why an opportunity should be
 “ so eagerly snatched, to treat with con-
 “ tempt that part of his character, which
 “ was least contemptible: If the poet had
 “ James in his thoughts, he was no very
 “ skilful encomiast.” Yet, such was the judgment of Shakspeare, that he commends the king for those colloquial accomplishments, in which he excelled; at a time too, [1604] when this part of his character was best known to his English subjects. The king too, as he came through Berwick, had shewn his attendants, both by his *talk* and his *performance*, that he knew, full as much as kings generally do, of the *art* and *practick* of gunnery. Mr. Steevens has added a note, which, as it is equally inapplicable to the
 subject,

subject, neither confirms the remarks of Johnson, nor exposes the inaptness of Warburton (*m*). Notwithstanding what is thus, feebly, said, by the three critics, I am of opinion, that Shakspeare meant, in 1604, to offer to King James, a panegyric, which the audience felt to be just; because the accomplishments were real: The poet may have been induced to make an offering of his panegyric; partly from motives of gratitude, and partly from feelings of emulation; Shakspeare had received favours from King James; and he saw, at the same time, Daniel, and Drayton, Ben Jonson (*n*), and Dugdale (*o*), offering, severally, their encomiastic strains.

Such are the reasons, which induce me to be of opinion, that Shakspeare made interpolations in his own play, in 1604, as well as in 1599. Nor, is it any strong objection,

(*m*) Steev. Shak. 1793, vol. ix. p. 371-2.

(*n*) Ben Jonson published, in 1604, a brief panegyric of his Majesty's first and *well auspicated* entrance to his High Court of Parliament.

(*o*) *The Time Triumphant*, 1604.

to say, that Meres did not mention Henry V, in 1598: For, Meres did not mention other undoubted dramas of our poet, which had been certainly produced, before the *Wit's Treasury* was written: Neither can a negative argument be opposed, effectually, to affirmative circumstances.

On the whole, it appears to me, from weighing all probabilities, that the four dramas, which derive much of their interest, from the character of Falstaff, were all written, successively, in 1596, and in 1597: But, Henry V, was, undoubtedly, produced the last. In it, Falstaff does not come out upon the stage, but dies of a sweat, after performing less than the attentive auditors were led to expect: And in it, ancient Pistol appears, as the husband of Mistress Quickly; who also dies, during the ancient's absence, in the wars of France.

Yet; do the commentators bring the Knight to life, and revive, and unmarry, the dame, by assigning the year 1601, as the epoch of the *Merry Wives of Windsor*. Queen Elizabeth is said, by the critics to have com-
manded

manded those miracles to be worked, in 1601; a time, when she was in no proper mood for such fooleries. The tradition, on which is founded the story of Elizabeth's command to exhibit the facetious knight *in love*, I think too improbable for belief. The maiden queen knew perfectly well, that Sir John had, all his life, been an intriguer among the wretched women of the town; and she might thence infer, that it would be no great feat to bring so crafty a sharper to intrigue with the merry women of Windsor. But, it was a harder task, which the omnipotence of Elizabeth could not perform, to bring Falstaff to real life, after being positively *as dead as nail in door*. Whatever a capricious queen might have wished to have seen, the audience would not have born to see the dead knight, on the living stage; the buried Quickly put on again the intriguing chambermaid; and the married Pistol transformed into an old batchelor. Such transitions are too violent, for fiction to create; for credulity to believe, or simplicity to admire!

The

The conclusion of the second part of Henry IV, was not very favourable, for Falstaff's speedy appearance among the *Merry Wives of Windsor*. Sir John had been sadly frowned on, by royal Hal, as a *vain man*; the Knight, who owed a thousand pounds to Master Shallow, was subjected to this disgrace, before the disappointed eyes of the Gloucester Justice; and Falstaff was, by the Lord Chief Justice, committed to *the Fleet*: When Sir John took his bed, whence he never rose, Mistress Quickly, who knew his *conditions*, remarked, "the King has killed "his heart." Nym, soon after, adds, "the King hath run bad humours on the "Knight; that's the even of it." Pistol, immediately, subjoins,

"Nym, thou hast spoke the right;
"His *heart* is *fractured*, and corroborate."

With all his gaiety, and spirits, both natural, and assumed, Falstaff's *heart* became *fractured* when he saw himself scorned by the King; when he found himself committed by the Chief Justice; and feeling the infirmities of age, and fearing the dangers of
want,

want, he lost hope ; and “ a burning quotidian tertian” sent him, from the house of Mistress Quickly, to his “ dishonourable grave.”

It is apparent, therefore, that “ the pleasant and conceited comedy of Sir John Falstaff and the Merry Wives of Windsor” could not, by any propriety of fiction, or consistency of judgement, be interposed between the second part of Henry IV, and Henry V. If it be true, as Doctor Johnson affirmed, that the first, and second parts of Henry IV, are only two, because they were too long to make one ; if it be true, as the first act of the second part evinces, that Sir John, soon after *doing good service at Shrewsbury*, was sent off, with some charge, to Lord John of Lancaster, at York ; He could not, consistently, faunter to Windsor, after his rencounter with the Chief Justice. When to all those reasons are added the allusions, and intimations of the Merry Wives of Windsor ; and when it is considered, as it must be admitted, that the objections of the commentators are groundless ; it will be found, that

found, that the true epoch of that comedy is 1596; and, that its proper place is before the first part of Henry IV: Thus will the propriety of the poet's fiction, and the consistency of action in his characters, be happily preserved!

No. XIV.—THE MERCHANT OF VENICE,
1597.

This fine Comedy had forced itself on the notice of the world, before Meres wrote his *Wit's Treasury*, in 1598. It was, indeed, entered, for publication in the Stationers' Registers, on the 22d of July, 1598. Yet, it does not follow as an inference, from the foregoing facts, that the *Merchant of Venice* was written, in 1598, as the Commentators assert (p).

The circumstance of *The Bond* was certainly taken, as Dr. Farmer suggested, from *The Orator*, which was published in 1596. This intimation proves, that the *Merchant of Venice* may have been written, either, in

(p) Steev. 1793, vol. i. 538.

1597, or in 1596. From this state of uncertainty, we may be relieved, by attending to an allusion, which did not catch the commentator's eyes: The merchant exclaims:

“ ——— Nor, is my whole estate.

“ Upon the fortune of *this* present year.”

The question then, is, what year was it, which was a year of dread to traders? Monday, the chronicler, shall answer the question: After taking notice of the losses of Spain, from the capture of Hulst, in 1596, he adds: Then, did the “ King of Spain dis-
“ pense with himself for payment of his
“ debts, which made many merchants in
“ Spain, *Italy*, Antwerp, Amsterdam, and
“ Middleburgh, to become *banquerouts*(*q*).” While the balance was thus vibrating, between the years 1596, and 1598, this curious fact fixes it for 1597.

No. XV.—HAMLET, 1597.

This captivating Tragedy, like other dramas of Shakspeare, appears to have been preceded by a play, on the same subject, and

(*q*) Monday's Briefe Chron. 1611, p. 422.

with

with a similar title, as early as 1589. On this foundation, deriving some materials from the prose history of Hamlet, this skilful dramatist built his celebrated play of the same name; though it is not easy to ascertain, exactly, the true epoch of its composition. It was certainly printed, in 1604; having been previously entered in the Stationers' Registers, on the 26th of July, 1602. Gabriel Harvey seems to have seen some copy of Shakspeare's Hamlet, as early as 1598: while Meres appears, at the same time, not to have heard of what had already attracted the notice of the dramatical world. In Lodge's *Devils Incarnate*, 1596, there is an allusion, indeed, to "*the Ghost*, who cried "so miserably in the theatre, *Hamlet*, revenge (r)." If this passage could be, clearly, shown to allude to Shakspeare's Hamlet, the fact would prove, in opposition to the commentators, that this play was written, in a prior year.

There are several intimations, in this play, which, plainly, refer back to the year 1596,

as already past. The enterprize of Fortinbras on the skirts of Norway, is supposed to be;

“——— The main motive of our preparations;

“ The source of this our watch; and the chief end

“ Of *this post-haste and romage* in the land (s).”

In the midst of the commotions in Ireland, the Archduke of Austria, suddenly, attacked Calais; and Queen Elizabeth, hearing of this event, ordered some forces to be raised, *the same day*, being *Sunday*, during *divine service*; in order to assist the French King, and to secure her own kingdom (t). In April, 1596, a thousand men were levied in Kent, for the relief of Calais (u): On the 23d of May, a levy of a number of soldiers was made, who were to repair to Dover for the defence of Calais (x). In July, 1596, the Queen's castles, along the Kentish coast, were furnished with great quantities of munition (y). In September, 1596, two thou-

(s) Steev. 1793, vol. xv. p. 14-15.

(t) Camden in Kennet, vol. ii. p. 591.

(u) Burleigh's Diary, in Murden St. pap. 808.

(x) Ib. 809. (y) Id.

land men were sent to France, under the conduct of Sir Thomas Baskerville (z). Speaking of the *portentous* appearance of the ghost, the poet adds, as a circumstance, which forboded some great event:

“ ———— *And the moist Star,*

“ Upon whose influence Neptune’s Empire stands,

“ Was sick almost to Dooms-day with eclipse.

Now; it is a fact, sufficiently known, by the sad effects, that the summer of 1596, was a season remarkably *wet*; so that the husbandmen could scarcely secure their crops; the prices of grain rose to an unexampled height (a): And, in December, 1596, the ports were opened for the importation of corn (b): All these were deemed by the poet:

“ The prologue to the Omen coming on

“ How heaven and earth together demonstrated

“ Unto our Climates and Countrymen.

While so much doubt exists, with regard to the true epoch of this tragedy, those facts, and circumstances, fix it, with suffi-

(z) Burleigh’s Diary, in Murden St. Pap. 809.

(a) Chron. prices. (b) Murden 811.

cient certainty, to the beginning of the year, 1597.

There is another intimation, (indeed, which must refer to a subsequent period: It is the announcing of the *players*, by Rosencrantz, to Hamlet, who asks, "How chances it they travel?" "I think," says Rosencrantz, "their inhibition comes, by means of the late *innovation*." The commentators have, grievously, miscarried, in attempting to explain this passage, which was first quoted by Holt; because, they did not know the fact, to which the dramatist alluded (c): The allusion applies, pertinently, to the Order of the Privy Council, of the 22d of June, 1600, "for the *restraint* of the "immoderate use of *play-bouses*," which, naturally, drove the *tragedians* of the city, into the country. There appears to be no other striking event, in scenic story, to which the *inhibition*, by *innovation*, could relate, without going back to the year 1589, in which year, regular commissioners were ap-

(c) Steev. 1793, vol. xv. p. 122—3.

pointed, for reviewing the productions of our dramatists. The statute of the 39th of Elizabeth (*d*), for preventing *common players* from *wandering abroad*, which has been quoted in explanation of that allusion, by Mr. Malone, would have had a quite contrary effect, than the consequence of driving the *Tragedians* of *the City* into the *Country*. This passage, then, as it was thus plainly pointed to a remarkable event, in June 1600, must have been added, among other *additions*, before the republication of this tragedy, in 1604: For, the title-page of it declares this play to have been *enlarged to almost as much again as it was, according to the true and perfect copy*(*e*). From all those facts, and allusions, it is more than probable, that Hamlet, like other dramas of Shakspeare, was first sketched, early in 1597, and, ultimately, finished, in 1600, with *additions*, which well suited that portentous year.

(*d*) Ch. 4.

(*e*) Steev. 1793, vol. xv. p. 15.

If Gabriel Harvey, whose book I have not seen, had not spoken so positively, in 1598, of the previous publication of Shakspeare's Hamlet, I should have been induced, by facts, to have fixed the *original* sketch of Hamlet, in 1600. There were, in this year, long continued disputes with the Danes, in respect to trade, and fishery. The royal Dane confiscated the English ships; the Queen resented this arbitrary conduct; and commissioners were appointed to settle, by treaty, a trade, which had been begun by private interest, and was now discontinued by false policy (*f*). Such altercations must have made such a play uncommonly attractive to a London audience. During this year too, there were constant complaints of a sad scarcity of corn; owing to *immoderate rains*, which had fallen in the autumn of 1599, and to the cold spring time of 1600 (*g*). The notice of our observant dramatist was strongly drawn, no doubt, to those various events, which created public clamour.

(*f*) Camden, in Kennet, vol. ii. p. 625.

(*g*) Ib. p. 626.

No. XVI. KING JOHN, 1598.

This tragedy exhibits, to the discerning eye, another example of Shakspeare's custom, of borrowing, continually, from preceding writers, *plots*, sentiments, speeches, and language (*b*). As early as 1591, there had been a play, entitled, *The troublesome Raigne of Jobn King of England*. Shakspeare's tragedy was known to Meres, in 1598; as he names it in his *Wit's Treasury*, among our poet's other tragedies. It was, soon after, still better known to Marston, who plainly copied, as his custom was, when it suited him, a line of Shakspeare's drama into his *Insatiate Countess*, which was published, in 1603.

Shak. "Why holds thine eye that lamentable rheum,

"*Like a proud river peering o'er his bounds?*"

Mars. "Then, how much more in me, whose youthful veins,

"*Like a proud river, overflow their bounds (i).*"

[(*h*) Steev. 1793, vol. viii. p. 1.

(*i*) Mal. Shak. vol. i. p. 1. p. 314.

Such are the proofs, which show pretty certainly, that Shakspeare's King John, was written, between 1591, and 1598. In order to draw these extreme points closer together, Mr. Malone says, that Shakspeare having lost his only son, in 1596, was brought, by this misfortune, into a proper temper, for writing the pathetic lamentations of Constance, on her Arthur's death. But, at what time of his life, was Shakspeare unfit for drawing similar scenes of deeper distress? Johnson has observed, in a note, on this play, what applies more pertinently to the purpose, "that many passages, in our poet's works, evidently show, how often he took advantage of the facts then, recent, and the passions, then in motion. (k)" The fact is, that there are many allusions, in Shakspeare's King John, to the events of 1596, and to some, in 1597; though the commentators have not been very diligent, to collect them. The Pope published a Bull, against Elizabeth, in 1596; and the

(k) Mal. Shak. vol. i. p. 1. p. 312: Steev. 1793, vol. viii. p. 81.

Pope's Nuntio made some offers to Henry IV, against Queen Elizabeth (1). The scene with *Pandulph*, the papal legate, which alludes to those offers, must, as Johnson remarks, have been, at the time it was written, during our struggles with popery, a very captivating scene (m). The contradictory, shifting, policy of England, and France, as represented in King John, forms an admirable parody on the *adverse*, friendly, conduct of Elizabeth, and Henry the IV (n). Let the siege of Angiers, in King John, be compared with the loss, and recapture of Amiens, in 1597, chiefly by the valour of the English reinforcements, under the gallant Baskerville. The altercations between the bastard, *Falconbridge*, and *Austria*, while the conduct of the Archduke Albert was so unpopular in England, must have afforded a rich repast to an English audience; There is a strong allusion, particularly, in the last act, to the quarrel between Essex, and Raleigh, which

(1) Camden in Kennet, vol. ii. p. 601.

(m) Steev. vol. viii. p. 81.

(n) Camden in Kennet, vol. ii. p. 595.

began

began at Calais, in 1596, and rose to a more remarkable height, in 1597 (o). Owing to the many piques among the great, occasioned by the selfish ambition of Essex, the concluding remark of Falconbridge must have been felt, and applauded, by the auditory :

“ ————— Nought shall make us rue,

“ If England to itself do rest but true.

If to all those intimations, we add the remark of Johnson, how much advantage Shakspeare, constantly, derived from facts *then recent*, and the *passions then in motion*, there can no doubt remain, but that our poet's King John must be fixed to the spring time of 1598; as the true epoch of its original production.

No. XVII.—A MIDSUMMER'S NIGHT'S
DREAM, 1598.

This is supposed to be one of Shakspeare's most early Dramas, from the liveliness of its imagery, and the reiterations

(o) Camden in Kennet, vol. ii. p. 594, 597.

of its rhimes; the narrowness of its fable, and the indistinctness of its principal characters. It is certain, indeed, that this play was entered in the Stationers' Registers, in 1600; and is even mentioned by Meres, in 1598 (p). — *not need ever from*

The year 1595 was, originally, assigned, as the epoch of the Midsummer's Nights Dream (q). This date has, however, been, since, altered to 1592 (r), by one of those *wondrous changes of a fatal scene*, which we frequently meet with, in this dramatical chronology. I see no good argument, for changing the epoch from 1595, to 1592: But, for better reasons, I am of opinion, that it was written, early in 1598.

In the fine speech, with which Theseus opens the 5th act (s), in answer to Hippolyta's exclamation, "'Tis strange, that these lovers speake of," he remarks:

"One sees more devils than vast hell can hold."

(p) Wit's Treasury.

(q) Steev. 1778, vol. i. p. 285.

(r) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 497.

(s) 5 Steev. 1795, p. 140.

This

This is, plainly, a farcaism on Lodge's pamphlet, called "Wits Miserie, and the Worlds Madnesse; discovering the *In-*
" carnate Devils of this age," which was published, in 1596. Theseus had already remarked, in the same speech :

"The lunatic, the lover, and the poet,

"Are of imagination all *compact*."

Lodge has the same word *compact*, as singularly coupled: "Heinofous thoughts
" compact them together." It is curious to see, in the present day, the characters, which Lodge, then, bestowed upon those contemporary poets, whom he thought the most celebrated; in 1596(*1*): Lilly is famous for facility in discourse; Spenser is best read in ancient poetry; Daniel is choice in word and invention; Drayton is diligent and formal; T. Nash is the true English Aretine. But, forgetting Shakspeare, Lodge only says, generally: "All
 "you unnamed professors, or friends of
 "poetry (by me inwardly honoured) knit

(1) *Incarnate Devils*, p. 57.

" your

“ your industries in private to unite your
 “ fames in public : Let the strong stay up
 “ the weak, and the weak march under
 “ the conduct of the strong.” Owing to
 this preference given to other poets, Shak-
 speare, who had certainly read Lodge’s
 pamphlet, because he borrows thoughts,
 and expressions, from it (*u*), now returned
 marked disdain, for contemptuous silence.
 There is another passage in Lodge’s Satire,
 which Shakspeare may have felt (*x*):
 “ They say likewise, there is a *Plaijer-*
 “ *Devil*, or handsome son of Mammons;
 “ but yet, I have not seen him, because
 “ *he skulks in the country* : If I chance to

(*u*) Incarnate Devils, p. 40.

(*x*) In p. 46, Lodge, in describing his *Lecherous Devil*,
 the patron of Peticote-lane, says, “ If he take up Com-
 “ modities, it is Cock-sparrows, potato’s and herrings
 “ [Eringoes] and the hottest wines are his ordinary
 “ drink, to increase his courage.” With this, compare
 what Shakspeare says, in *The Merry Wives of Wind-*
for; “ Let the sky rain *potatoes*, hail kissing comfits,
 and snow *Eringoes* :” And mark what is said in *Troilus*
 & *Cressida*, “ How the *Devil* luxury, with his fat rump
 “ and *potatoe* finger, tickles these together.”

“ meet

“ meet him against the next impression,
 “ he shall shift very cunningly, but I’ll
 “ pleasantly conjure him ; and though he
 “ hath a high hat to hide his huge horns !
 “ I’ll have a wind of wit to blow it off
 “ speedily : If they use but Entrapelian
 “ urbanity, and pleasure mixed with ho-
 “ nesty, it is to be born with all ; but,
 “ filthy speaking, scurrilitie unfit for chaste
 “ ears, that, I wish with the Apostle,
 “ should not be named among Christians :
 “ Again, in stage plays, to make use of
 “ hystorical scripture, I hold it, with the
 “ *Legists*, odious ; and as the Council of
 “ Trent did, I condemn it.”

There was a poem, entitled, *Pyramus and Thisbe*, published by Dr. Gale, in 1597 ; but, Mr. Malone believed this to be posterior to *The Midsummer’s Night’s Dream*. On the contrary, I believe, that Gale’s *Pyramus and Thisbe*, was prior to Shakspeare’s most lamentable “ Comedy of Pyramus and Thisby.” The Author of the Comedy of *Doctor Dodipol*, which was published, in 1596, or before this year, either
 borrowed

borrowed a line from Shakspeare; or Shakspeare borrowed from him; as indeed, Mr. Steevens has acutely shown:

DR. DODIPOLL:

" 'Twas I that led you through the painted mead,
 " Where the light faeries danc'd upon the flowers;
 " *Hanging in every leaf an Orient pearl.*"

Midsummer's Night's Dream:

" And hang a *pearl* in every Cowslip's ear."

Again:

" And that same dew, which sometimes on the buds,
 " Was wont to swell, like round and *Orient pearls*,
 " Stood now within the pretty flourets eyes,
 " Like tears, &c."

I am thus led, by my premises, to infer, that Shakspeare, according to the laudable practice of the bee, which steals luscious sweets from rankest weeds, derived his extract from Dodipol; and not Dodipol from Shakspeare.

It is to be remembered, that the second volume of the *Faery Queen* was published, in 1596; being entered in the Stationers' Registers, on the 20th January 1595 6. This, for some time, furnished town-talk; which never fails to supply our poets with
 dramatical

dramatical topicks. The Faery Queen helped Shakspeare to many hints. In the *Midsummer's Night's Dream*, the second act opens with a fairy scene: The *fairy* is forward to tell,

"How I serve the *fairy queen*,

"To dew her orbs upon the green:

"And jealous Oberon would have the child

"Knight of his train, to trace the forests wild,"

Here, then, are obvious allusions to the *Faery Queen* of 1596; as may also be inferred from the imitations from *Dr. Dodi-pol*, and from other allusions to the *incarnate Devils*: If to these two, we add the *Faery Queen* of 1596, the couplement will give a demonstration, that the *Midsummer's Night's Dream* was written subsequent to 1596.

In the first act of *The Midsummer's Night's Dream*, Egeus comes in, full of vexation, with complaint against his daughter, *Hermia*, who had been bewitched by *Lyfander* with rhimes, and lovetokens, and other messengers of strong prevailement in unhardened youth: And claimed, of the Duke, the

the ancient privilege of Athens; insisting either to dispose of her to Demetrius, or to death,

“ ——— according to our Law,

“ Immediately provided, in that case.”

Warburton, who has always at hand, his sagacity, or his learning, to find what is not to be found, has remarked, on this passage, that, by a law of Solon, parents had the power of life and death over their children; that the poet may have supposed, that the Athenians had such a law before the age of Solon; that perhaps the Dramatist neither thought, nor knew, any thing of the matter (y). But, Shakspeare never went to a distance, for what he saw passing before him. Our observant Dramatist, probably, alluded to the proceedings of Parliament, on this subject, during the session of 1597. On the 7th of November of that year, the bill was committed, for depriving offenders of clergy, who, against the statute of Henry VII, should be found guilty of

(y) 5 Steev. 8.

the taking away of women against their wills(z). On the 14th of November 1597, there was a report to the House, touching the abuses from *licences for marriages, without bans*; and also touching *the stealing away of men's children without the assent of their parents*(a): On the same day, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, brought a message from the maiden Queen, about "the horrible and great incestuous marriages, which had been discovered in the House; minding due punishment of the same, in particular of the members of the House(b)." These obvious allusions to striking transactions, of an interesting nature, carry the epoch of this play beyond that session of Parliament, which ended on the 9th of February, 1597-8(c).

(z) D'Ewes Journal, 552.

(a) Ib. 556: vid. 39 Eliz. ch. 9, particularly, the recital thereof: This, then, is Shakspeare's law; "immediately provided, in that case."

(b) Id. And see what is said about Adultery and Bigamy in *The Incarnate Devils*, 1596. p. 51.

(c) D'Ewes, 546.

In the second scene of the second act of *Midsummer's Night's Dream*, there is a fine description, of a very unfavourable season :

“ Contiguous fogs, which falling in the land,

“ Have every pelting river made so proud,

“ That they have overborn their Continents :

“ The Ox hath therefore stretch'd his yoke in vain ;

“ The Ploughman lost his sweat ; and the green
Corn,

“ Hath rotted, ere *his* youth attain'd a beard.”

In fact, the prices of corn rose to a great height in 1597 (*d*) ; and, during the same year, in addition to the miseries of famine, there was a great plague in London, which carried off eighteen thousand persons (*e*). These facts confirm the previous circumstances, which would fix the epoch of this fairy play, to the beginning of the year 1598.

It has been supposed, however, upon very slight grounds, that there is an allusion to the death of Spenser, “ *late deceased*,

(*d*) Cambrone's Enquiry into the prices of grain, p. 32.

(*e*) The Brit. Chronologist, 173.

“ in beggary :” But, this bewitching Drama was certainly written before September 1598 : And, at that time, Spenser was living, very quietly, in his Castle of Kilcolman, within the county of Cork ; and was destined, by the Queen, to be High Sheriff of that shire(*f*) : It was in October, 1598, that the Irish rebellion, breaking out with the instantaneous force of a flash of lightning, involved Spenser in ruin. Such are the facts, and arguments, which have convinced me, that the *Midsummer's Night's*

(*f*) The diligence of Mr. Malone has discovered a Letter from Queen Elizabeth, dated the last day of September 1598, to the Irish Government; recommending Spenser to be Sheriff of Cork : Mr. Malone had before the merit of discovering the pension to Spenser. If to these acts of munificence of the Queen, we add the grant of his land and castle, the total is a demonstration, that Spenser was not neglected : And, consequently, that Slander ought no longer to cast her obloquy on Elizabeth and Burleigh, but on the Irish rebellion. It seems unnecessary to remark, that if the Lord Treasurer Burleigh had set himself against the poet, he never would have obtained either his pension, or his land.

Dream was not written, in 1595, or in 1592, but in 1598.

NO. XVIII.—THE TAMING OF THE SHREW,
1598—1606.

Among the commentators, there have been various opinions, both with regard to the writer, and the time of writing, of the *Taming of the Shrew*. The best informed critics seem now to acknowledge, that this comedy was written by Shakspeare, as, indeed, the play itself evinces; but, that a very different dramatist wrote, about the same time, perhaps, a comedy called *the Taming of a Shrew*. After ascertaining a few facts, and adjusting some circumstances, I am of opinion, that Shakspeare, originally wrote *his* comedy, in 1598; and afterwards revived, and improved it, in 1606.

The commentators have remarked, that as it abounds in doggerel verses, which indicate inexperience, and in the play of words, which he latterly condemned, it must be of early composition. And, Meres, who mentions twelve of Shakspeare's dramas,

mas, in his *Wit's Treasury*, which was finished before September 1598, did not mention the Taming of *the* Shrew, among our poet's plays. Shakspeare obviously borrowed the names of two of his characters from *The Supposes* of Gascoyne, which was first acted in 1566, and published among his works, which were printed, a second time, in 1587; adopting, moreover, from Gascoyne's comedy, sentiments, and language. Add to all these proofs of an early composition, that there certainly was a similar Taming of *a* Shrew, published before 1596, perhaps, in 1594; from which Shakspeare may have borrowed both the moral, and the name.

There is in Shakspeare's Taming of *the* Shrew, a remarkable passage, that the commentators have overlooked; as they did not know the contemporary history, to which it related:—

“ 'Tis death for any one in Mantua

“ To come to Padua: Know you not the cause?

“ Your Ships are stay'd at Venice: And the Duke,

“ For private quarrel, 'twixt your Duke and him,

“ Hath published, and proclaimed it openly:

" 'Tis marvel ; but that, you 're but newly come,
 " You might have heard it else proclaimed about."

This significant passage, plainly, related to the commercial warfare between the Emperor, and Elizabeth, which ended in avowed prohibitions, by open proclamations. The Emperor Rudolph published an edict, at Frankfort, on the 10th of September, 1597; banishing the merchant adventurers of England from their residence at Stade. In retaliation, Queen Elizabeth issued a proclamation, on the 14th of January, 1597-8; commanding the merchants of the Hans Towns, to depart out of her dominions; The Mayor, and Sheriffs of London, were directed to remove the foreign merchants, who usually resided in *the Steelyard*; and who, however, had address enough to obtain the respite of a month (g). It is easy to perceive, that such transactions must have made noise enough, in such a City as

(g) Those curious documents are contained in a miscellaneous volume, which once belonged to Mr. Henry Powle, the Speaker of the House of Commons, at the Revolution; and which is now in my Library.

London,

London, to reach the quick and observant ears of Shakspeare. There is something said in the 3d and 4th acts, about irregular marriages, which may have alluded to the proceedings of Parliament, in 1597, on the same subject. Before circumstances, pregnant as these are, loose conjecture, from vague declamation, must give way to accuracy of dates, and submit to decisiveness of facts.

There are, moreover, sufficient grounds, for believing, that Shakspeare revised, and improved, the first sketch of the *Taming of the Shrew*, in 1606. The old play, on the same subject, was revived, and published, about the same time; being entered in the Stationers' Registers, on the 22d January, 1606-7. Shakspeare's comedy was entered, in the same Registers, on the 17th November, 1607. A very particular occasion, which the commentators have overlooked, gave rise to a competition at the theatres, and among the booksellers. It was the arrival of the *Royal Dane*, in London; and, the banqueting on that joy-

ous event. Lord Salisbury, the Secretary of State, wrote to the Ambassador Winwood, on the 19th of July, 1606, "the King of Denmark arrived yesterday at Greenwich, being met first by the King and the Prince below Gravesend: It is thought his abode here will be forty days (h)." He, in fact, departed, on the 14th of August, 1606. While he remained, there were nothing but carousals; royal, no doubt; yet grossly intemperate, and highly voluptuous. According to Shakspeare, there was

"Nothing but fit and fit, and eat and eat."

Sir John Harrington has, indeed, left us a very amusing account of one of those banquets (i); wherein "the representation of Solomon's Temple, and the coming of the Queen of Sheba, was made after dinner. The lady who did play the Queen, coming to present precious gifts to the Kings, and forgetting the steps,

(h) Winw. Mem. vol. ii. 247.

(i) This extremely interesting Letter is in the *Nugæ Antiquæ*, vol. ii. 126.

“ arising to the canopy, overset her caskets
 “ into his Danish Majesty’s lap, and fell at
 “ his feet : Napkins were at hand to make
 “ all clean : His Majesty then got up, and
 “ would dance with the Queen of Sheba,
 “ but he fell down, and humbled himself
 “ before her ; and was carried to an inner
 “ chamber, and laid on a bed of state,
 “ which was not a little defiled with the
 “ presents, such as wine, cream, jelly,
 “ which the Queen had bestowed on his
 “ garments (k).” The *Induction* to the
 Taming of the Shrew, which exhibits
 drunkenness to the eye, and the under-
 standing, in the most ridiculous light ; was
 properly revived, at a moment, when
 “ the English Nobles, whom I never could
 “ get,” says Sir John Harrington, “ to taste
 “ good liquor, now wallow in beastly de-
 “ lights : The ladies, abandoning their
 “ sobriety, are seen to roll about in intox-
 “ ication.” There is another allusion to
 that period, which seems to shew, that the

(k) The whole Letter is well worthy of perusal.

original outline may have been now filled up, from an attention to recent events :

“ At last, though long, our jarring Notes agree.

“ And time it is, when raging war is done,

“ To smile at *'Scapes* and *perils* over blown (*l*).”

This may have alluded, specially, to *the Gun-powder plot* of November, 1605, or it may have related, more generally, to foreign warfare : For, on the 16th of November, 1606, Winwood wrote to the Secretary of State (*m*), “ that the *leaguer* is “ *dissolved*.”

NO. XIX.—ALL'S WELL THAT ENDS
WELL, 1599.

This play is supposed, by the commentators, to have been mentioned in *The Wit's Treasury* of Meres, in 1598, under the name of “ *Love's Labours Won*.” There is said to be, in this comedy, an allusion to the dispute with the Puritans, which began in 1598, and continued, during the remainder of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. These are

(*l*) Steev. vol. vi. 544. (*m*) Mem. vol. ii. 264.

the principal reasons, for their assigning the year 1598, as the true epoch of *All's Well that Ends Well* (n).

But, let us search for more satisfactory reasons, to justify the adoption of that epoch. The examination of *Parolles* will perhaps furnish a better argument. "This " is Monsieur *Parolles*," says the first Lord, " the gallant *militarist* (that was his own " phrase) that had the whole *theorick* of " war in the knot of his scarf, and the " practice in the chape of his dagger." In 1597, was published, as the commentators remark, " the *theorique and practice* of " *warre*, written by [to] Don Philip Prince " of Castil, by Don Bernardino de Mendoza. " Translated out of the Cistilian tongue in " [to] Englishe, by Sir Edward [e] Hoby, " Knight (o)."—4to. [without the name of the printer, the publisher, or the place.] I am of opinion, however, that this *translation* is not the book, which was alluded to by Shakspeare. In 1598, there was pub-

(n) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 538.

(o) Ib. vol. vi. p. 324.

lished,

lished, by Ponsoby, “*The Theorike and Practicke of moderne warres discoursed in dialogue wise*: Written by Robert Barret.” This author was the *gallant militarist*: For, he tells himself, as Shakspeare intimates, “that he had spent most part of his time in the profession of arms, and that, amongst foreign nations.” He adds a prayer “for *true martial valour* to the service and defence of our dread soveraigne and deare countrie.” In this book of Barret’s, there is much knowledge, but still more affectation: He particularly affects *foreign words*: Abanderado, Ambuscado, Bando, Burgonet, Camerada, Camisada, Escalada, Esquadra, Fila, Fronte, Garrita, Hargulatie; and a thousand others, which are equally uncouth: “The word *Caporal*, which is a mere Italian, we do *corruptly* write *Corporal*,” says this *gallant militarist*. We now see the source of the foreign terms, which Shakspeare uses, in the examination of *Parolles*: *Portotarosso*, *Bosco chimurcho*, *Boblibindo chicur-*
murco

murco (p). The whole examination of Parolles appears to me, to be a continued sarcasm on Barret's *Theorike and Practike* of Warre, written *dialoguewise*. Shakspeare, whose recollection of the past, was equal to his observance of the present, may have had in his mind, "the examination
 " of one of Henry the Eighth's Captains,
 " which had gone over to the enemy in the
 " *Life of Jack Wilton, 1594;*" as Mr. Ritson has observed (q). For these reasons, it appears to me very probable, that *All's Well that Ends Well*, which was neither entered in the Stationers' Registers, nor printed till 1623, was written, early in 1599, rather than in 1598; because, the poet must be allowed time to form his plan, to collect his thoughts, and to give them expression.

No. XX.—MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING,
 1599.

This comedy, which is celebrated for its reciprocations of smartness between Bene-

(p) Steev. Shak. 1793, vol. vi. p. 323.

(q) Steev. 1793, vol. vi. p. 323.

dick, and Beatrice, was printed in 1600; and was, previously, entered in the Stationers' Registers, on the 23d of August, in the same year: But, it was not mentioned by the well informed Meres, in 1598. From the foregoing premises, the commentators inferred, that this comic drama was first written, in 1600; without reflecting, that it must have been represented on the stage, before it was entered in the Stationers' Registers; and that it must have been written, before it was represented.

In the midst of this uncertainty, about the precise year, it is reasonable to enquire, for some note of time, which would give us more certainty about the epoch. In the opening scene, Leonato asks Don Pedro's messenger, "How many gentlemen have you lost in this action?" Beatrice immediately enquires, "Is Signior Montanto, (meaning Benedick,) returned from *the wars*?" *The wars*, which, at that time, fixed the attention of the court, the city, and the country, were Essex's campaign in Ireland, during the Summer of 1599. Being
told

told by the messenger, that Benedick was returned, and as pleasant as ever; Beatrice follows up her question, with some other enquiries: "I pray you how many men
 " hath he killed, and eaten, in *these wars*?
 " —But how many hath he killed? for
 " indeed, I promised to eat all of his killing."
 The messenger answers; "He hath done
 " good service, lady, in *these wars*." Beatrice, who was not to be foiled, readily replied: "Yes; you had *musty victuals*,
 " and he hath help to eat it." There can be but little doubt, that *the wars*, which were thus mentioned, alluded to the Irish campaign of 1599. The fact is, as we may learn from Camden, and from Moryson, that there were complaints of the badness of the provisions, which the contractors furnished the English army in Ireland. And such a sarcasm, from a woman of rank, and fashion, and smartness, must have cut to the quick; and must have been loudly applauded by the audience; who, being disappointed by the events of the campaign, would be apt enough to listen to a lampoon,

on

on the Contractor, rather than on the General; who, by his great pretensions, and small performances, had disappointed the expectations of the Queen, and the hopes of the nation. From all those intimations, it appears to be more than probable, that *Much Ado About Nothing* was originally written, in the autumn of 1599.

No. XXI.—As You Like It, 1600.

The genuine epoch of this Comedy has never been settled, by satisfactory reasons. It was certainly written, in the period, between 1596, and 1600; and it was entered in the Stationers' Registers, on the 4th of August, 1600. In Orlando's verses, in praise of his mistress, it is said:

" From the *East* to *western Ind*,

" No jewel is like Rosalind:

" Her worth being mounted on the wind,

" Through *all the World* bears Rosalind.

Here are obvious allusions to the frequent voyages for distant discovery, which seem to have ended, for a time, in 1596. The fountain, which Stow relates to have been

set

set up, during the year 1596, in Cheapside, with *Diana* in the fountain, is plainly alluded to in *As You Like it*. In this Comedy, there is quoted a line of Marlow's *Hero and Leander*, which was certainly published before the year 1598 (r). It seems to be more than probable, that the intrigues at Court, which became apparent to every eye, after the return of Essex from Ireland, on the 28th of September, 1599, may have extorted the following sarcasm of Shakspeare:

Duke Sen. Now, my Co-mates, and brothers in exile,
 "Hath not old custom made this life more sweet
 "Than that of painted pomp? Are not these woods
 "More free from peril than the envious Court?"

If there be any allusion, in these reflections, to the fall of Essex, who was sequestered from Court, soon after his arrival, the epoch of *As You Like it*, must be fixed in the winter of 1599. There can be no doubt, that it was imitated by Drayton, in

(r) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 547.

his *Owl*, which was first published, in 1604 (s).

NO. XXII.—TROILUS AND CRESSIDA, 1600.

This play, like other dramatical productions of Shakspeare, was preceded by an earlier drama of a very different poet, on the same subject (t): The *Troilus and Cressida* of Shakspeare was entered in the Stationers' Registers, on the 7th of February 1602-3; though it was not printed 'till 1609: And, it was, therefore, probably, written, in 1602, say the Commentators (u). It was certainly acted before the accession of King James: For, it is a fact, which is recorded, in the Stationers' Registers, that *Troilus and Cressida* had been acted by the *Lord Chamberlain's men*, who became the King's servants, at his accession to the throne (x).

Yet, none of those intimations settle the

(s) Harden's Biog. Mirror, vol. i. p. 104-5.

(t) Steev. 1793, vol. ii. p. 482.

(u) Ib. p. 565. (x) Id.

precise

precise epoch, when *Troilus and Cressida* was written. This drama, however, was plainly burlesqued, as the Commentators remark (z), by the comedy, entitled, *Histrionastix*, which though published, in 1609, was written before the demise of Elizabeth. It is that passage in Shakspeare's drama, wherein, at parting, Troilus gives Cressida his sleeve; and she, in return, gives him her glove: *Histrionastix* ridicules it, in an interlude, wherein Troilus and Cressida held the following colloquy:

Troil. "Come, Cressida, my Cressit light,
 "Thy face doth shine both day and night,
 "Behold, Behold, *thy garter blue*
 "Thy Knight his valiant Elbow wears,
 "That when he shakes his furious speare,
 "The foe, in shivering fearful fort
 "May lay him down in death to snort."

Cress. "O Knight, with valour in thy face,
 "Here, take my *skreen*, weare it for grace;
 "Within thy Helmet put the same,
 "Therewith to make thy enemies lame (z).

(y) Ib. p. 565.

(z) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 567.

As there can be no doubt, that Shakspeare's *Troilus and Cressida* was attacked by ridicule, since the farcasm is so palpable, the only question, among accurate reasoners, must be, when *Histrionastix*, or the *Player-whipt*, was originally written? *Histrionastix* was, certainly, written, as the Commentators acknowledge, in the time of Elizabeth; since she is greatly panegyryzed by the most obvious flattery, in the last scene, under the name of *Astrea*. The *Player-whipt* was probably written, in 1601, during Essex's conspiracy; because, it speaks of *the wars*, and talks of *a new plot*: There is, besides, a fine scene of anarchy; the anarchists enter, calling out for *liberty*; and depart, exclaiming *liberty* (a). *Histrionastix* was, most probably, written before Justice had yet inflicted punishment on the traitors: For, Chrisoganus, the scholar, or wise man, speaks of "driving back the roaring torrent on the authors heads; that all eyes may see,

(a) Sign F. 2.

" justice

“justice hath whips to scourge impiety.” These allusive passages seem to imply, that the appropriate punishments had not yet been inflicted on Essex, and his followers (*b*). If this theory be true, then, Shakspeare’s *Troilus and Cressida* was written, in 1600.

Add to all those intimations some analogous passages, which cast a very vivid light upon a dubious point. Shakspeare appears to have scoffed at Lodge’s *Incarnate Devils*, 1596; and to have been himself ridiculed, by the author of the *Player-whipt*; though the shortsightedness of the Commentators seem to have allowed this satiric current to glide unheeded by them. In Shakspeare’s *Troilus and Cressida*, Thersites exclaims: “How the *Devil luxury*, with his fat rump, “and *potatoc-finger*, tickles these together!

(*b*) Essex, Rutland, Southampton, and their associates, were declared rebels, by the Queen’s proclamation, dated the 15th of February, 1600-1. On the 19th of February, Essex, and Southampton, were brought to their trials: And a few days after; Merrick, Blount, and Danvers, were executed.

“ Fry luxury fry !” The *Player-whipt*, for the purpose of ridicule, introduces a merchant’s wife, with her apprentice, in the market place :

Wife. “ Ha’ ye any *potatoes* ?

Seller. “ Th’ abundance will not quit cost the bringing.

Wife. “ What’s your *Cock-sparrows* a dozen ?

Seller. “ A penny, Mistress.

Wife. “ There’s for a dozen (c).”

This Comedy, which was thus fruitful in itself, and the cause of fruitfulness in others, was so much monopolized, by the Court of the maiden Queen, that it appears

(c) Sign B. 3. There is a most learned disquisition by Mr. Collins, in Steev. Shak. 1793, vol. ii. p. 453, on the *fructuous* qualities of the potatoe, in that age; which has been reprobated, for its *lusciousness*, with all the prudery of *Oldmaidism* by the still more learned writer of the prose-poetry, yclept, *The Pursuits of Literature*: It would be worthy of the deepest research of this Omniscient Scribbler, to investigate the cause, why the *potatoe* should have preserved to this day its *fructuous* powers in Ireland; yet to have lost its *invigorating* qualities in Britain, since the auspicious reign of the Maiden Queen; who, yet, did not die a maid, if we may believe the obstetrick Mr. Steevens. [Shak. 1793, vol. i. p. 557.].

to have been with-held from *the million*, during her reign : Certain, however, it is, from the before-mentioned facts, that *Troilus and Cressida* was produced, in 1600 ; and not in 1602, as the Commentators assert (*d*).

No. XXII.—TIMON OF ATHENS, 1601.

The writing of this drama, which is said, by Johnson, to be *a domestic Tragedy*, is placed by the Commentators, in 1609 ; because, they did not know where to place it (*e*). The story had been forced upon the attention of Shakspeare, by many preceding writers. Mulcaster, the grammarian, had remarked in his *Positions*, 1581 ; “ But, “ some *Timon* will say, what should women “ do with learning.” Critic *Timon* was, indeed, mentioned, in *Love's Labours Lost*.

(*d*) Mal. Shak. vol. i. part 1. p. 342, and for an intimation, that this Comedy had been monopolized by the Court. [*ib*. p. 343].

(*e*) Mal. Shak. vol. i. p. 372 ; Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 599. In Steev. 1778, vol. i. p. 337 ; the epoch assigned to *Timon* was 1610.

The same character was still more elaborately displayed in *The Incarnate Devils*, 1596: In exposing the *Fiend Tepidity*, Lodge observes: "This made certain discontented
 " (as Timon, and Apermantus) (*f*) waxe
 " careless of body and soule, fretting them-
 " selves at the worlds ingratitude, and get-
 " ting over all diligent endeavour to serve
 " the fury of their unbridled minds: The
 " stories registered are full of men thus af-
 " fected; and who considereth the most com-
 " monwealths of Christians, shall, I fear,
 " (and let me write it with griefe) find more
 " opportunity lost by coldness, slackness,
 " and delay, than consideration can remedy
 " with many years heart break, and study."

This is a *domestic Tragedy*; and, therefore, strongly fastens on the attention of the reader, says Johnson: The catastrophe affords a very powerful warning against that ostentatious liberality, which scatters bounty, but confers no benefits; and buys flattery, but not friendship. The scene lay

(*f*) It is to be noted, that *Apermantus* is the Churlish Philosopher in Shakspeare's *Timon*.

in

in Athens; but, the moral was applied to London. In this drama, there are several intimations, which prove, that it was written, during the reign of Elizabeth; since the *wars* are often spoken of; and there were commotions in the city of London, which did not exist there, during the subsequent reign: the first thief says:

“ Let us first see peace in Athens.”

The whole play is an accurate delineation of the state of men, and things, in London, during the year 1601, and the existence of Essex's rebellion: In persuading the return of Timon, the first senator observes:

“ ——— So soon we shall drive back
 “ Of Alcibiades, the approaches wild,
 “ Who, like a boar too savage, doth root up
 “ His Country's peace.”

Here is as exact a picture of Essex, as, at that period, it was fit to draw. The senators, in the last scene, describe the various messages, which were sent by the Queen to Essex:

“ ——— Noble and Young,
 “ When thy first griefs were but a mere conceit,
 “ Ere thou hadst power, or we had cause of fear,

" We sent to thee ; to give thy rages balm,

" To wipe out our ingratitude, with loves

" Above their quantity."

We may even learn, from Timon's exclamations, that execution had been done on some of Essex's followers :

" ——— Thatch your poor thin roofs

" With *burdens of the dead ; some that were hang'd ;*

" No matter".

Nor, could the poet give plainer intimations, without departing from dramatical propriety. Add to those facts, and circumstances, that there was produced, in 1600, a play on the same subject, which still remains in MSS. ; and from which Shakspeare, obviously, borrowed, what he has amply repaid(*g*). Such are the reasons, which, as any argument is more persuasive than none, induce me to be of opinion, that Timon of Athens was written, in 1601 ; but was neither entered in the Stationers' Registers, nor published, till it was printed, in the first folio, in 1623.

The Commentators, however, have their

(*g*) Mal. Shak. vol. viii, p. 4.

objections

objections at hand. Yes; I am ready to cry out, with *Hotspur*, they have

“Such a deal of skimble skamble stuff, as puts me from my Faith.”

When Shakspeare once began to study North's Plutarch, say they, it is not probable, that he would cease, till he had exhausted it of all its dramatic subjects. On the foundation of this supposition, another was built: Julius Cæsar, Anthony and Cleopatra, Timon, and Coriolanus, are supposed to have been written in succession: While he was writing *Cymbeline*, in 1605, and *Macbeth*, in 1606, there is reason to believe, say they, that he began to study Plutarch, with a view to the stage(*b*). The Commentators speak of the editions of Sir Thomas North's Translation of Plutarch, in 1579, 1602, 1603; but they appear not to have known, that there was an edition, in 1595(*i*), which is probably the

(*b*) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 600.

(*i*) I have in my Library the Edition of 1595; so that there can be no dispute about the fact of its existence.

very

very edition, which our poet studied ; as the first edition came too early, and the last editions too late, for his instructive perusal : When he wrote Hamlet, in 1596, Shakspeare appears to have been then perfectly acquainted with the Roman Story ; and, he is said, by the Commentators, to have acquired, from North's Plutarch, his acquaintance with the Roman Annals. In Hamlet, Shakspeare speaks, familiarly, of " the Portends, which foretold the death " of mightiest Julius : " Again, when he is about to meet the Queen, Hamlet exclaims ;

" ——— Soft ; now to my mother.

" O heart ! lose not thy nature ; let not ever

" The *Soul of Nero* enter this firm bosom :

" Let me be cruel ; not unnatural :

" I will *speake* daggers to her, but, *use* none."

The inferences, then, from the supposed studies of Shakspeare, in *North's Plutarch*, during the reign of King James, are thus overthrown by more pregnant circumstances ; which remove all objections, and leave upon the mind conviction.

No. XXIII.—THE WINTER'S TALE, 1601.

The *Doraftus* and *Faunia* of Green, which was published, in 1588, furnished Shakspeare with the plot of this Comedy; and, it seems to have been preceded, like the other dramas of Shakspeare, by a *Winter Night's Pastime*, in 1594: The Winter's Tale was neither published, nor entered in the Stationers' Registers, till 1623; nor was it mentioned by Meres, in 1598.

The commentators gave it, originally, as their opinion, that *the Winter's Tale* had been written, in 1601, or 1602; but, they have since fixed the epoch of it, on very slight evidence, to the year 1604 (*k*). They appear to have been carried away from the vicinity of truth, on this occasion, by a quotation of Blackstone, from Shakspeare, which furnished a proof to him, and to them, that the Winter's Tale was not written till after the demise of Elizabeth:

“ ——— If I could find example

“ Of thousands, that had struck *anointed* Kings

(*k*) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 572—77.

“ And

“ And flourish’d after, I’d not do it ; but, since,
 “ Nor brass, nor parchment bears not one,
 “ Let villainy itself forswear it.”

These lines, say Blackstone, and the commentators, could never have been intended for the ear of her, who had deprived the Queen of Scots of life: To the son of Mary they could not have been very agreeable (*l*). Now, mark how a plain tale shall put down a confident assumption. Strype, who cannot be too much praised for his labours, informs us, that “ *after* the rebellion
 “ of the Earl of Essex, were certain pray-
 “ ers, fit for the time, set forth, by au-
 “ thority, to be used thrice a week, on the
 “ prayer days, in the churches.” This laborious historian has preserved two of those prayers (*m*): The first is a thanksgiving
 “ prayer for the merciful deliverance of our
 “ most dread Sovereign Lady, thy vicege-
 “ rent, in her dominions, Queen Elizabeth,
 “ as ever heretofore, so at this time, from
 “ the traiterous attempts, and desperate de-

(*l*) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 576.

(*m*) An. Reform, vol. iv. 354—5.

“ signments

“ signments of sundry most unkind, and
 “ disloyal-like persons, who forgetting their
 “ duty to thee, O Lord, and towards thine
 “ *anointed*, have, in the *height of their pride*,
 “ after a popular sort, with divers false pre-
 “ tences, and many slanderous calumnia-
 “ tions, fought, in open rebellion, not only
 “ the *extinguishment* of thy servant, our com-
 “ fort, and our glory, but the tragical over-
 “ throw of this our native country.” The
 prayer then beseeches “ the God of Hosts
 “ to defend still the sacred person of our
 “ Sovereign Lady, from all such dangerous
 “ designments, her kingdoms from all trea-
 “ cherous practices, and us, her subjects,
 “ from the crafty allurements of all *popular*,
 “ and *ambitious dissembling* Absoloms.” The
 second prayer speaks of thy handmaid, *thine*
Anointed; and of thine own *anointed* Magis-
 trate. Shakspeare, then, seems to have
 merely translated the sentiments of those
 public prayers, into dramatic poetry, as he
 frequently did the prose narratives of Hol-
 lingshed; and to have adopted the empha-
 tical expression, *anointed Kings*, instead of
anointed

anointed Magistrate. He was induced to do this, according to his usual custom of catching every temporary topick; in order to captivate the audience; who, while under the influence of those prayers, must have received the quoted passage with loud applause.

During that momentous period, neither Elizabeth, nor her people, entertained one thought of Mary Stuart, who fell, by the stroke of a *legal* instrument, at least; which was used, in consequence of an address of Parliament, and of a popular call: The unhappy Queen of Scots fell by a stroke of a very different kind, from that of Shakspeare at anointed *Kings*, by that *tumultuous villainy*, which was so strongly reprobated in those authorized prayers.

Blackstone's remark discovers, then, a mind, which was not very amply stored with historical knowledge, relating to that eventful age. There is, in the second scene of the first act, a passage, which was much more likely to *tear* Elizabeth to *the quick*:

Leontes. "Thou mightst bespice a Cup,

"To give mine Enemy a lasting wink;

"Which draught to me were cordial."

Cam.

Cam. ——— “ Sir, my Lord,

“ I could do this, and that with no rash potion,

“ But with a lingering dram, that should not work

“ Maliciously, like poison: But, &c.”

It is an historical fact, which is incontrovertibly certain, that Elizabeth employed agents to take off her hated rival, by a *lingering dram* (n): And, upon the principle of Blackstone, she might have *blench'd*, at the recital of *Leontes' solicitation to bespice a cup*.

There is a sarcasm, in *the Winter's Tale*, levelled at the *Puritans*; which is an additional proof, that this comedy was written about the period of Essex's conspiracy:—

“ There is but one *Puritan*, among them,

“ and he *sings psalms* to hornpipes.” His-

tory has recorded the popular tricks of that ambitious anarchist; how he courted the *Puritans*; how he had *psalm-singing* in Essex-house: And, Hume, the historian, breaks out against those *religious artifices* with unusual warmth.

There is another note of time, in the first

(n) See Tytler's Inquiry, 4 Ed. 1790, p. 320.

scene,

scene, of the fifth act, which furnishes a decisive proof against *the theory* of the commentators. Leontes laments the wrong he did himself; "which was so much, that "*beirless* it hath made my kingdom." Dion remonstrates to Paulina, who objected to Leontes' second marriage:

" ——— If you would not so,

" You pity not the state, nor the remembrance

" Of his most sovereign name; consider little

" What dangers by 'his highness' *fail of issue*,

" May drop upon his kingdom, and devour

" Incertain lookers on."

The pertinence of this passage would have struck the audience; and every one must have felt the *danger*, by *her highness's fail of issue*, which *might devour even incertain lookers on*. The whole allusion was finely adapted to the state of the public mind; which had been harassed by the dispute about the succession. The suspense, wherein the whim of Elizabeth kept *incertain lookers on*, to the last, about her successor, no longer existed, after the accession of James, who was far from *beirless*. After this event, the audience would have disdained that fine passage,

sage, as idle declamation. *The crown* had now *found an heir*. And, to have longer talked about the dangers of uncertainty, when none were felt, nor foreseen, would have been rejected by the audience, as senseless fiction.

For the foregoing reasons, I concur with Horatio Walpole, the late Lord Orford, in thinking, that *the Winter's Tale* is one of Shakspeare's *historical* plays which was designed as a compliment to Elizabeth, during a moment of unhappiness: But, I do not consider this drama *as a second part to Henry VIII*, which was written, at a subsequent period, and on a different occasion. I presume to think, that the proofs, which I have adduced, are quite sufficient to satisfy any reasonable mind, that the *Winter's Tale* was written, in the troublous year 1601. Mr. Malone, indeed, mentions the report, which was entered in the Stationers' Registers, in 1604, of a monstrous fish, that appeared in the *form of a woman*; and that may have been alluded to by Shakspeare: But, such a story is too destitute of the cer-

tainties of time, place, and circumstance, to repel the stronger proofs for a prior epoch.

NO. XXIV.—MEASURE FOR MEASURE,
1604.

For the story of this drama, we are referred, by Pope, to *Cinthio's Novels*; and by Farmer, with more certainty, to the *Historie of Promos and Cassandra* of Whetstone; though the hints, which were derived from Whetstone are so slight, according to Mr. Steevens, that it is almost impossible to trace them (o): Yet, amidst all this research, for the true origin of *Measure for Measure*, it was forgotten, that it is obviously founded on the departure of King James, from his ancient kingdom, when he set out for his new dominions; and that, though the imaginary scene was laid at *Vienna*, the real scene was at London (p). This comedy must

(o) Steev. 1793, vol. iv. p. 176—7.

(p) Among the ornaments, which have been provided, by Harding, for Shakspeare, there is prefixed to this Comedy a *View of Vienna*: There had been much more

must have been written, then, subsequent to April, 1603, and before the year 1607, when it was plainly imitated by Barksted (*q*), who adopted a thought from him, that might well lend a little, since he had borrowed much from so many others himself.

There is not one of Shakspeare's plays more darkened than this, by the peculiarities of its author, the unskilfulness of its editors, and the negligence of transcribers, saith Johnson: These remarks are so just, Mr. Steevens subjoins, that he declined to attempt much reformation. The opening speech of *the Duke* is, indeed, so embarrassed, as to have puzzled all the commentators; and they have, at last, left it but nonsense:

more propriety, and use, in giving an accurate draught of London, at the accession of King James; since there is so much talk about a proclamation, which was issued by him, for the pulling down of new houses in the suburbs.

(*q*) In *Myrrha*, the Mother of Adonis, or Lust's Prodigies, by Wm. Barksted, a poem, 1607. [Mal. Shak. vol. i. p. 345.]

Duke. "Of Government, the properties to unfold,
 Would seem, in me, to affect speech, and discourse;
 Since *I* am put to know, that your own science,
 Exceeds, in that, the lists of all advice,
 My strength can give you: Then, no more remains, [for
 me]

But that, to your sufficiency, as your worth is able,
 And [I] let them [sufficiency and worth] work: The
 nature of our people.

Our City's institutions, and the terms
 For common justice, you are as pregnant in,
 As art, and practice, hath enrich'd any,
 That we remember: There is our Commission,
 From which, we would not have you warp."

The commentators seem not to have remarked, that the character of *the Duke*, is a very accurate delineation of that of King James, which Shakspeare appears to have caught, with great felicity, and to have sketched, with much truth. The obscurity, and the uncouthness, of this speech, are partly owing to the purposed affectation of the poet; but still more to the blunders of the transcribers. Knowing that King James's writings; his *Basilikon Doron*; his *True Law of free Monarchies*; and other treatises; had been, emulously, republished, in 1603, by
 the

the London booksellers, in many editions, Shakspeare could not fitly give a closer parody. With such a key to the real purpose of the poet, this declamation on the *properties of government* must appear, at once, appropriate, and humourous. The darkness of this speech, which the commentators have failed to illuminate, after showing their lights, begins to be impenetrable in the fifth line: we are to recollect, that the Duke is speaking, unfitly, sometimes in the plural [we], and sometimes in the singular [I]; and, beginning to reason from the foregoing premises, he infers:

“ ——— Then, no more remains, [for me,]

“ But that, to your sufficiency, as your worth is able,

“ [I] (*r*) let them [your science, sufficiency, worth,] work.

This simple alteration of *I* for *and* makes

(*r*) The pronoun personal [I] was often confounded, in writing, with *aye*, or *yes*; particularly, in Townshend's *Tables*, and in D'Ewe's *Journals*; and Shakspeare more than once writes *I* for *aye*, as Johnson observes: Now, I conjecture, that the blunder of the transcriber was begun by writing *aye* for *I*; and was completed, by writing *and* for *aye*.

complete sense; though the speech be rendered obscure by impropriety, and confounded by affectation.

In the second scene of the third act, the character of the Duke is fully investigated, with a striking allusion to the real character of King James (s). It may not be displeasing to the reader to see a sketch of the character of King James, as it was drawn by a spy of Queen Elizabeth's, in 1586; when that prince was under twenty one years of age (t):

“ Generally, he seemeth desirous
 “ of peace, as appeareth by his disposition
 “ and exercis; viz. 1st. his great delight in
 “ hunting; 2dly. his private delight in en-
 “ diting poesies; and in one, or both of
 “ these, commonly, he spendeth the day,
 “ when he hath no public thing to do;
 “ 3dly. his desire to withdraw himself,
 “ from places of most access, and company,
 “ to places of more solitude, and repose,
 “ with very small retinue; 4thly. his readi-

(s) See Mal. Shak. vol. ii. p. 77-78-79.

(t) From a MS. in Mr. Astle's Library.

“ nefs to compose matters, that might trou-
 “ ble his peace, though with some disad-
 “ vantage. In religion, he is soundly af-
 “ fected, as may be presumed from these
 “ reasons: 1st. His hearing the word of
 “ God almost daily, viz. on Sundays, fore-
 “ noon, and afternoon; on Wednesdays,
 “ and Fridays, in the forenoon, besides a
 “ chapter read, and some exposition after
 “ every meal, 2dly. His promptness in the
 “ scriptures, wherein he is thought to be as
 “ ready, as any man within his realm.
 “ 3dly. His care to give good example, by
 “ repairing to the ordinary sermons in Edin-
 “ burgh Church. 4thly. His often deriding
 “ popery, in his common discourse, and
 “ denying mass to the French Ambassador.
 “ 5thly. His life, and conversation, which
 “ though it be touched somewhat with
 “ the common faults of the country, viz.
 “ with swearing sometimes; and whereof
 “ a special cause is, the want of sound com-
 “ pany about him; yet, he keepeth it in
 “ good order; and as a young prince is of a
 “ stayed behaviour, void of licentiousness

“ and notorious faults; showing good signs
 “ of modesty, as blushing sometime, when
 “ he speaketh in presence; and the report
 “ is of those, who are nearest about him,
 “ very chaste, and yet desirous of marriage.”
 Several of those characteristics are alluded
 to throughout *Measure for Measure*:

“ ——— I love the people,
 “ But, do not like to stage me to their eyes:
 “ Though it do well, I do not relish well
 “ Their loud applause, and ayes vehement:
 “ Nor, do I think the man of safe discretion,
 “ That does affect it.”

This is said, by the commentators, to be
 intended as a *courtly apology*, for the *stately*
 and *ungracious* demeanor of King James, on
 his entry into England (u). No: The fault
 of this prince was *too much familiarity*, and
 not stateliness; he was good natured, and
 not ungracious; he did not like to *stage* him-
 self to the people's eyes; because, he de-
 lighted in retirement, in the company of a
 few, in study, and in writing. His charac-
 ter appears to have been strangely misrep-

(u) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 568,

sented

sented by Mr. Malone, and by Mr. Steevens; who would delude others, as they were themselves deluded by Wilson, the most prejudiced, and factious, of historians. On the contrary, Shakspeare did not intend to make any apology, but merely to give *traits of character*, which the commentators did not comprehend.

King James found the nation engaged in a twenty years war with Spain, which is often alluded to in this comedy. A peace was concluded, at London, on the 18th of August, 1604: And, the treaty was printed by Barker, the royal typographer, from authority, in 1605: The allusions to the war are not, then, *decisive proofs* of the writing of this play, in 1603, as the commentators assert, with more confidence than ratiocination.

There is much allusion also to the plucking down of houses in the suburbs. The clown asks the bawd: "You have not heard
 " of *the proclamation*, have you?" "What
 " proclamation, man?" answers the bawd,
 " All houses in the suburbs must be plucked
 " down,"

"down," rejoins the clown. How much superior is Shakspeare to his commentators! He makes such characters, as the clown, and bawd, talk vaguely, and vulgarly, like such persons: The commentators search every where for illustrations, except in *the proclamation* itself. Let us investigate, fully, what will carry us, directly, to the point in question.

During the whole reign of Elizabeth, it was a policy, which her councils continually enforced, to prevent the increase of London. In the 35th of Elizabeth (x), a bill was passed for restraint of buildings in London. On the 7th of July 1580, a proclamation was issued, commanding all persons to desist from new buildings (y): On the 22d of June, 1602, this proclamation was renewed, and enforced (z). After the accession of King James, the same policy was pursued. A proclamation, against inmates, and for the pulling down of *new erected* buildings, was

(x) 1 Lord's Journal, 521, D'Ewes, 521.

(y) Rym. Foed. Tom. 16. p. 449.

(z) Id.

issued

issued on the 16th of September, 1603. But it had as little effect upon interest, and fashion, as any former edict (*a*). On the 1st of March, 1604-5, a similar proclamation was issued; but with as little effect. A fresh proclamation was issued on the 12th of October, 1607, which was enforced by prosecutions in the Star Chamber: Yet, the building spirit of the town was not to be repressed, even by the Star Chamber. In 1614, more proclamations were, therefore, issued: And, from this year, is said to have begun a reformation in the buildings (*b*).

In order to enable us to decide against which of those proclamations, Shakspeare threw out his satire, from the tongues of the clown, and bawd, we must carry our investigation a step further. In the second scene of the first act, the bawd announces the bad news of Claudio being imprisoned "for getting Madam Julietta with child." Claudio complains of "*the neglected act*

(*a*) Howes's Stow, 828.

(*b*) Strype's Stow. Hist. of London, vol. i. p. 8.

" *being*

"being enforced against him." Isabella laments her being the sister of one Claudio, condemned, on the *act of fornication*, to lose his head. Now; the act, which was thus alluded to, though not with the precision of an Old Baily Solicitor, "was the statute to restrain all persons from marriage, until their former wives, and former husbands be dead," for which such persons, so offending, were to *suffer death*, as in cases of felony (c). It was against this act, then, which did not operate till after the end of the session, on the 7th of July, 1604, that Shakspeare's satire was levelled. All those events must have actually taken place; and must have created some bustle, and town talk, before our dramatist exhibited his characters on the stage, speaking of them. From all those facts, and circumstances, *Measure for Measure* appears to have been

(c) 2 Ja. 1. ch. 11; 1604. Yet, the offenders were, and are entitled to the benefit of clergy; there had been a former act, on this subject, 1 Edw. vi. ch. 11, which justifies Claudio's complaint, that a *neglected Act* had been enforced against him.

written,

written, in 1604, instead of 1603, which last epoch cannot be supported, against such coincidences of proof.

No. XXV.—KING LEAR, 1605.

The Commentators have traced, with great diligence, the various sources, whence Shakspeare may have derived his hints, and helps, when he sat down to write his *Lear*: The Faery Queen, the Arcadia of Sydney, the Remaines of Camden, the Chronicle of Hollingshed, the Mirror for Magistrates, the True Chronicle History of King Leir, and the most famous Historie of Leire, King of England, and his three daughters (*d*):

But

(*d*) While the Commentators were collecting every mention of Leire and his Daughters, they might have added "A Defence of Brutes and Brutus's History," 1593, by Edward Harvey, the Brother of the famous Gabriel Harvey. The Author gives, in p. 16, "The Geneology or issue of Brute:"—"Bladud begat Leyr; Leyr begat three Daughters; the first was Gonorill, the second Ragan, and the third *Cordeil*: "Leyr gave half his goodes to his two eldest daughters, "at their marriage; and made them mightier than
" himselfe,

But none of these authorities influenced him in the choice of the particular moment to sit down, and write "The Tragedy of Lear, which is deservedly celebrated among the dramas of Shakspeare."

If I might adopt the argument of the commentators, I should say, that Shakspeare read, no doubt, what every body else read, in 1603, the *Basilikon Doron* of King James; or His Majestie's Instructions to his dearest Sonne: Herein the poet saw what was written before the King's accession: "In

"himselfe, for speaking to him *pointedly*; but he gave nothing with Cordeil to her Dowry, because she told him an open truth without anie forgerie." We may herein also see, that from Ragan descended *Gorbodug*, who begat *Ferrex* and *Porrex*. Edward Harvey, being a young man, undertook the hard task of defending Geffry Monmouth against Master Buchanan, the trumpet of Scotland: "We may best areede, who is most credible a Monmouth, or a Scot, a *Moonke*, or a *Travailer*," concludes Edward Harvey; who wanted neither learning, nor spirit. Like some of the Scholars of the present day, on the subject of Troy, a kindred tale, he thought it "a *dangerous position* to refuse the offspring of *Brute*, both in regard of all reverend antiquities, and in respect of our own Countrymen."

"case

“ case it please God to provide you all these
 “ three kingdoms, make your eldest sonne
 “ Isaac, leaving him all your Kingdoms, and
 “ provide the rest with private possessions:
 “ Otherwise, by dividing your kingdoms,
 “ yee shall leave the seed of division, and
 “ discord, among your posteritie; as besel
 “ this isle, by the division, and assignment
 “ thereof, to the three sonnes of Brutus:
 “ Locrine, Albanact, and Chamber (e).”

The poet knew, also, that the King had strongly recommended to his first Parliament, *the union* of his two Kingdoms; which was not received with the same sentiment of conciliation, nor an equal sense of policy, in the House of Commons (f); though an act did pass, “ appointing commissioners to treat
 “ *for the weal* of both Kingdoms (g).” On the 15th of September, 1604, a proclamation was issued; appointing the 20th of October, and the Painted Chamber, for the day, and place

(e) Norton's Edit. 1603, p. 66. Polidore Virgil was King James's historian, for this British Story.

(f) 1 Jour. everywhere.

(g) 2 Jac. 1. ch. 2.

of meeting of the Commissioners, for this interesting treaty. From all those facts, it is easy to infer, that this recent circumstance, which had thus drawn the public attention, also fixed the determination of Shakspeare, to write, dramatically, on the story of Lear. Whether he adopted, for his drama, the *British* story, by design, or accident, I know not ; if by design, his choice was most judicious ; if by accident, it was most lucky : For, our British ancestors were always ruined by *their divisions* ; wanting nothing but peace *at home*, to make them invincible. The *moral* of Lear, then, is the most important, which can be exhibited by scenic action, to a people ; in order to inculcate, by examples, the dangers of division, and the benefits of union.

Shakspeare, certainly, borrowed the fantastical names of spirits, which appear in this Tragedy, from Harfnet's *Declaration of Popish Impostures*, which was published, in 1603. Lear is ascertained, to have been

(h) Rym. Foed. 16 tom.

written,

written, after the month of October, 1604; say the Commentators: For, King James was proclaimed King of *Great Britain*, on the 24th of October, 1604; and, it is evident, that Shakspeare made a minute change in an old rhyming saw:

“ ———— Fy, fa, fum,

“ I smell the blood of an *English* man;”

which Shakspeare, with great attention to the times, changed, in the following manner:

“ His word was still, Fie, foh, fum,

“ I smell the blood of a *British* man.”

But, the fact is, that there was issued from Greenwich a royal proclamation, on the 13th of May, 1603; declaring that, till a compleat union, the King held, and esteemed, the two realms, as *presently* united, and as one kingdom: and, the poets, Daniel, and Drayton, who wrote gratulatory verses, on his accession, spoke of the two kingdoms, as united, thereby, into one realm, by the name of Britain; and of the inhabitants of England and Scotland, as one people, by the denomina-

E'e

tion

tion of British (i). Lear was entered in the Stationers' Registers, on the 26th November, 1607, and is, therein, mentioned to have been played, during the preceding Christmas, before his Majesty at Whitehall: But, though this may have been the fact; yet the inference does not follow, that it had never been, formerly, acted before any audience. After weighing the whole evidence, I concur with the Commentators, that Lear was, probably, written, early in 1605; though

(i) Before King James arrived at London, Daniel offered to him "A Panegyrike congratulatory, delivered to the King's most excellent Majesty at Burleigh-Harrington in Rutlandshire;" which was printed, in 1603, for Blount, with a Defence of Rhime:

"Lo here the glory of a greater day
 "Than *England* ever heretofore could see
 "In all her days
 "And now she is, and now in peace therefore
 "Shake hands with union, O thou mightie state
 "Now thou art all great *Britain*, and no more,
 "No *Scot*, no *English* now, nor no debate."

This very rare publication of Daniel confutes, by the fact, the Commentators reasoning, from the proclamation: For, we see how a poet did write, before any proclamation issued upon the point.

they

they are, undoubtedly, mistaken, in some of their premises (*k*).

No. XXVI.—CYMBELINE, 1606.

The writing of this Drama, which, like *Lear*, is founded on the British Story, was originally assigned by the Commentators to the year 1604; as there appeared to be no intrinsic evidence, to direct the dubious course of the chronologist (*l*): But, the date is now fixed, mistakingly, by them, in 1605; because there is *little* internal evidence, by which this uncertainty might be ascertained: Neither was the play published, nor entered in the Stationers' Registers, till the general publication of Shakspeare's Dramas, in 1623. In Fletcher's *Philaster*, which was first acted in 1611, and written, as early as 1609, or perhaps as 1608, there is such an imitation of *Cymbeline*, as shows, that the rising dramatist

(*k*) See Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 577-79.

(*l*) Steev. Shak. 1778, vol. i. p. 320.

may have had his eye on the established poet (*m*).

Yet, is there an intimation of time, in Cymbeline, which escaped the search of the Commentators, and which will give an answer to the question, when was this play written? In the first scene of the second act, Cloten complains of a jackanapes, *who took him up for swearing*. This is a slight stroke at the statute, for *restraining the abuses of players*, by imposing penalties, on such dramatists, as profanely used the name of God (*n*), in any play, or interlude. Shakspeare aimed many a stroke at the correcting hand of the player's abuses, although he was, at the same time, deriving benefits from it: But, he cuts, delicately, with a razor, and never, like Ben Jonson, with a cleaver. By putting his complaint into the mouth of such a Prince as Cloten, our poet shows his usual skill in the knowledge of mankind, and gives an additional speci-

(*m*) Steev. 1793, vol. 1. p. 580.

(*n*) Com. Jour. vol. i. p. 293-4-300; 3 Jac. 1. ch. 21.
4 Blacks. Ed. Christ. p. 60.

men of his discrimination of character. This reforming statute commenced its operations on *the players*, from the end of the session, on the 27th of May, 1606: And, consequently, Cymbeline was written, while the yoke still sat uneasy on their necks, in 1606.

There is a little word, in this play, which, though it bear upon the time, afforded no light to the darkling chronologist; because he did not understand it. Belarius, moralizing on his way of life, exclaims:

“ ——— O! this life

“ Is nobler, than attending for a check;

“ Richer than doing nothing for a *babe*.”

The word *babe*, in this passage, which plainly means a petty *coin*, has defied the Commentators, who have searched in vain for its meaning (*o*). Yet, is *babe*, merely, the *babee* of the Scots coinage (*p*), which Shakspeare introduced, in Cymbeline, as a

(*o*) Mal. Shak. vol. viii. 385.

(*p*) Cardonel's Numismata, p. 33. The *babee*, is probably, derived from the *Ba-billion*.

fly stroke at the Scots coin, which King James had regulated by proclamation. In Moryson's Itinerary, 1617, we are told by that accurate observer (q): "Also the Scots
 " have a long time had small brasse *coynes*,
 " which, they say, of late are taken away,
 " namely, *Babees*, esteemed by them, of
 " old, for six pence, whereof two make
 " an English penny." The editors have only to change the spelling to *Babee*; and the player to pronounce it *trippingly on the tongue*; and the whole passage will have a sense, and smartness, which have been hitherto perverted by affectation, and obscured by ignorance.

NO. XXVII.—MACBETH, 1606.

With regard to this Drama, which has been always celebrated for its design, its execution, and its moral, there has never been any doubt, whether it were written before the accession of King James. As, however, it was not entered in the Station-

(q) P. 283.

ers'

ers' Registers, nor published, till the epoch of the first folio, in 1623, no helps can be derived from those circumstances, for fixing the year, when it was, originally, written.

It seems, now, more than probable, that Shakspeare was, greatly, indebted, for his *Witchery*, in *Macbeth*, to the tragi-coomodie of *the Witch*, which is said, in the title page, "to have been long since acted by his Majesties Servants, at the Blackfri-
"ers." As we now know, with sufficient certainty, that King James adopted the Lord Chamberlain's players, as the *royal servants*, this fact would, alone, settle the writing to be subsequent to that great event; though the commentators have doubted the precision of the inference, from their ignorance of the fact (*r*). The author of the *Witch*, Middleton, when he dedicated his play to Holmes, remarked that, "witches are (*ipso facto*) by the law con-

(*r*) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 589. Mr. Steevens has the merit of having first discovered how much Shakspeare had been obliged to Middleton, for much of the *machinery* of *Macbeth*.

“ demn’d.” This is an obvious allusion to the 2d Jac. 1. ch. 12, in 1604, for which the Commentators have substituted 1603.

When King James visited Oxford, in 1605, an interlude was acted before him, wherein the outline of Macbeth was represented so forcibly, as to strike the *royal pendant*, says Mr. Malone(s). Hearing of this favourable reception, Shakspeare determined to write his tragedy, knowing that he could readily find materials in Hollingshed’s Chronicle, his common magazine. The writer of *the Puritan*, which was published, in 1607, appears certainly to have scoffed at Banquo’s ghost, who intruded at Macbeth’s *banquet*: “ We’ll ha’ the ghost
“ i’ th’ white sheet sit at upper end o’ th’
“ table(t).”

The author of the tragedy of *Cæsar and Pompey*, which was published, in 1607, had plainly seen Macbeth :

(s) Mal. Shak. vol. i. p. 357.

(t) Steev. 1793, vol. vii. p. 476. The reference to the Puritan was first made by Dr. Farmer.

“ Why,

" Why, think you, lords, that 'tis *ambition's spur*,

" That pricketh Cæsar to those *high attempts* ?

The thought, and the expression, in these lines, were obviously borrowed from the celebrated passage in Macbeth :

" ——— I have no *spur*

" To prick the sides of my intent, but only

" Vaulting *ambition*, which o'er leaps itself,

" And falls at the other."

In Macbeth, we find a strong allusion to the healing *benediction*, which King James inherited with the English crown ; rather than arrogated from royal self-sufficiency, as Doctor Percy has, mistakingly, said (u) :

" ——— Comes the King forth, I pray you ?

" Ay, Sir : There are a crew of wretched souls,

" That stay his cure :

" ——— What's the disease he means ?

" ——— 'Tis called *the Evil*.

Shakspeare had some intimation of this passage from Hollingshed, his usual historian, as Mr. Malone has remarked. But, the fact is, that our poet was prompted to this allusion, by what he learned from Camden's Remains, in 1605 : " As for that ad-

(u) Steev. 1793, vol. vii. p. 535.

“mirable gift hereditary to the anoynted
 “princes of this realm [of England] in
 “curing the King’s Evil, I refer you to
 “the learned *discourse* thereof lately writ-
 “ten;” [*Charisma* of Doctor Tooker] (x).”

An attention to this extract from Camden clearly explains a passage in Shakspeare, which the commentators have mistaken :

“——— And ’tis spoken, and sworne, and done.”

“To the succeeding royalty he leaves

“The healing benediction.”

Such are the reasons, which induce me to concur with the Commentators, in thinking Macbeth was written, in 1606.

This interesting tragedy, opens with the entrance of three witches, in a storm of

(x) Cam. Rem. p. 4. It appears from the dedication to Sir Robert Cotton, that these *remains of a greater work* were sent to the press, as early as the 12th June, 1603. In Herbert’s Typograph. vol. ii. p. 1232, may be seen *Charisma sive Donum sanationis: Seu explicatio totius questionis de mirabilium sanitatum gratia, &c. Auctore Guil. Tookero, S. T. D. 1597.* On the back are the Queen’s Arms, to whom the book was dedicated. See also Doddsley’s old plays, Ed. 1780, vol. xii. p. 428; whereby it appears, that Dr. Borde wrote on the same subject, during the reign of Henry VIII.

thunder

thunder and lightning, who hold such a conversation as was perfectly fuitable to their supposed characters ;

1st Witch. When shall we three meet again ;
In thunder, lightning, or in rain?

2d Witch. When the *hurly burly's* done ;
When the battle's lost and won.

The commentators have been diligent to show, that Shakspeare had several precedents, as well as classic authority, for his *hurly-burly*, which might, otherwise, give offence to modern ears (y). But, their researches seem to have missed an example, which would have applied closer to the business, and *the time*: In Hake's *Gold's Kingdom*, and *this unhelping Age*, which was published in 1604 (z), there is a passage, on " the commendable government of the
" City of London, in the late times of the
" sickness, and decease, of the renowned
" Queen Elizabeth :"

" Fear, horror, trembling, and dismay of heart,

" Were eachwhere seen upon reports, that went,

(y) Steev. 1793, vol. vii. p. 325.

(z) London, for Windet, 4to. p. 22.

" That

" That our late Queen lay sick :—
 " In fine, when certainty of death was known,
 " Of her our Queen, did *hurly burly* rise ?
 " No, none at all : A bud then straightway blown
 " On self same stalk, did London well suffice,
 " To measure all things with an upright size :
 " The keys were kept for him, who did succeed,
 " And nought was heard, that *discrepance* might breed."

It is curious to remark, that when Heylin first printed his *Cosmography*, in 1621, he published the striking story of Macbeth, without seeming to know, that Shakspeare had dramatized it. But Shakspeare's drama was first published in 1623 : " We proceed
 " to the story of Macbeth," says Heylin,
 " than which for variety of action, and
 " strangeness of events, I never met with
 " any more pleasing. The story in brief,
 " is this : Duncan, King of the Scots, had
 " two principal men, whom he employed in
 " all matters of importance, Macbeth, and
 " Banquo. These two, travelling together
 " through a forest, were met by three
 " fairies, witches, (*weirds*, the Scots call
 " them) whereof the first, making obeys-
 " fance unto Macbeth, saluted him Thane
 " of

“ of Glamis, the second, Thane of
 “ Cawder, and the third, King of Scotland.
 “ This is unequaldealing, saith Banquo, to
 “ give my friend all the honours, and none
 “ unto me; to which one of the weirds
 “ made answer: That he indeed should
 “ not be a King; but out of his loynes
 “ should come a race of Kings, that should
 “ for ever rule the Scots. And, having
 “ thus said, they all suddenly vanished.
 “ Upon their arrival at court, Macbeth
 “ was immediately created Thane of Glam-
 “ mis; and not long after, some new service
 “ of his requiring new recompence, he
 “ was honoured with the title of Thane of
 “ Cawder. Seeing, then, how happy the
 “ prediction of the three weirds fell out in
 “ the former, he resolved not to be wanting
 “ to himself, in fulfilling the third; and
 “ therefore, he first killed the King; and
 “ after by reason of his command among
 “ the soldiers, and common people, he
 “ succeeded to his throne. Being scarce
 “ warm in his seat, he called to mind the
 “ prediction given to his companion
 “ Banquo,

“ Banquo, whom hereupon suspecting to
 “ be his supplanter, he caused him to be
 “ killed with his posterity ; Fleance, one of
 “ his sons, escaping only, with no small
 “ difficulty into Wales.” Thus far Heylin,
 who adds some other particulars, which
 were still more fictitious ; though not more
 fictitious, than the specimens of Scottish
 history, and Celtic jurisprudence, which
 the Commentators have retailed, in their
 notes, on this play, which is “ deservedly
 “ celebrated for the propriety of its fictions,
 “ and solemnity, grandeur, and variety of
 “ its action.”

No. XXVIII.—JULIUS CÆSAR, 1607.

The Commentators have steadily persevered, in their first judgements, with regard to the epoch of this tragedy. Like most of the other dramas of Shakspeare, *Julius Cæsar* appears to have had a *prototype*. William Alexander, who rose by his talents, to be Earl of Stirling, and Secretary of State for Scotland, published in 1607, *The Monarchicke Tragedies* ; Croesus, Darius, the

the Alexandrian, and *Julius Cæsar*; newly enlarged. From this last circumstance, we may fairly infer, that the *Julius Cæsar* of Alexander had been formerly written, for the amusement of his master, Henry, Prince of Wales. In arguing the question, whether Alexander borrowed from Shakspeare, or Shakspeare from Alexander, the Commentators have drawn their deductions from modern, rather than from ancient modes of reasoning, with regard to both the dramatists: As Shakspeare was in the habit of borrowing from every one, who had any thing to lend, it is more likely that he would borrow from Alexander, than Alexander from him; as there is no proof, that Alexander ever borrowed of any, except from the ancients. It is more than probable, that *the argument* of Alexander's play supplied Shakspeare, with his outline; as the play itself furnished Shakspeare with thoughts, and expressions, to fill up the figure. It is, therefore, improbable, that our poet produced his *Julius Cæsar* before the year, 1607.

It

It is more difficult to fix, by incontrovertible evidence, the precise time, when Shakspeare wrote his Julius Cæsar. There is some reason to believe, that this drama preceded, in point of time, the play of Anthony and Cleopatra, which was entered in the Stationers' Registers, on the 20th of May 1608 (a). Attending to those dates, and weighing all circumstances, we may conclude, with reasonable certainty, that Shakspeare produced his Julius Cæsar, in 1607. I have not observed any note of time, in the play itself, which would make this inference more certain.

No. XXIX.—ANTHONY AND CLEOPATRA,
1608.

This Tragedy, like Julius Cæsar, and other preceding dramas, had been suggested to the observant mind of Shakspeare, by prior intimations. Daniel had published a tragedy, in 1594, which was written, in-

(a) Mr. Steevens has the second of May, mistakingly, [Shak. 1793, vol. i. p. 432.]

deed,

deed, upon the ancient models, entitled *Cleopatra*; and entered in the Stationers' Registers, on the 19th of October, 1593. The *argument* of this poem may have furnished the more dramatic genius of Shakspeare with several hints, which he well knew how to work into a better form. He had seen in *The Devils Incarnate*, in 1596, which he had attentively read, what Lodge had remarked, how "Anthony, dallying
" in delights with Cleopatra, gave Cæsar
" opportunitie of many victories." It is certain, however, that Shakspeare's *Anthony and Cleopatra* was entered in the Stationers' Registers, on the 20th of May 1608 (*b*). If it be true, that Shakspeare wrote this tragedy, which Upton praises for its elevation of language, and Johnson censures, for want of discrimination of characters, as a sequel to his *Julius Cæsar*, it may, perhaps, have been written, in the beginning of the year 1608. It was not printed till the

(*b*) Steev. 1793, vol. xii. p. 405; wherein the date is again mistakingly placed on the *second* of May; as I have before remarked.

publication of the first folio, in 1623. The *Naval Combats* of this drama of Shakspeare's, which, no doubt, had their attractions, are supposed to have been ridiculed by Ben Jonson, in his *Silent Woman*, 1609; wherein *Morose* is made to remark; "Nay; "I would fit out a play, that were nothing "but fights at sea, drum, trumpet, and "target." (c)

XXX.—CORIOLANUS, 1609.

This Tragedy, which is said by Johnson, to be one of the most amusing of our author's performances, was neither entered in the Stationers' Registers, nor printed till the publication of the first folio, in 1623. The writing of *Coriolanus* has been assigned, though with a hesitating tone, to the year 1610 (d). Mr. Malone seems to have proved,

(c) *Ib.* vol. i. p. 599.

(d) *Mal. Shak.* vol. i. p. 372. *Steev.* 1793, vol. i. p. 599; yet, what was before assigned to the year 1610, in the end, is given, to 1609. [*Steev.* 1793, vol. xii. p. 3.]

with

with some acuteness, indeed, that the speech of Menenius, in the first act, whereby he endeavoured to convince the seditious populace, of the unreasonableness of their clamours, on the account of the scarcity, by the apologue of the several members of the body rebelling against the belly, was copied from *Camden's Remains*, rather than from *North's Plutarch*: Yet, this proof goes only the length of showing, that as Camden's work was published, in 1605, Shakspeare must have written his *Coriolanus*, subsequent to that publication: we are still left to enquire, even admitting this proof in its full extent, for the particular year.

Coriolanus opens with the entry of a company of mutinous citizens, who are "all resolved rather to die, than to *famish*." Caius Marcius, being deemed by them the chief enemy of the people, is, by a general *verdict*, sentenced, tumultuously, to death; the first citizen crying out: "Let us kill him; and we'll have corn enough, at our own price." Menenius, when he came to speak to the citizens, remarks:

F f 2

" ——— For

" ——— For your wants;

" Your suffering in *this dearth*, you may as well

" Strike at the Heaven with your staves, as lift them

" Against the Roman state:

" ——— For the dearth,

" The Gods, not the patricians, make it."

The dearth is afterwards acknowledged, in the senate-house, *to be great*: Now, the fact is, that the years 1608, and 1609, were times of *great dearth*; though the first was a year of greater dearth, than the last (*e*). King James, on account of the high prices of provisions, issued a proclamation against monopolists, in 1608 (*f*). It is said, in Raleigh's *Remains*, that two millions sterling were sent out, during those two dear years, for the importation of corn. The tragedy turns upon the *existing dearth*: And, therefore, the play was probably written, in 1609; while the pressure was yet felt.

Mr. Malone tries, indeed, to support his

(*e*) Combrune's Chron. Prices, p. 38. There was an insurrection, in Northamptonshire, on account of inclosures, in May, 1607.

(*f*) Ib. 39.

own epoch of the year 1610, by saying, that mulberry trees were not much known in England before the year 1609: Mr. Steevens has some doubt, with regard to this position, about the mulberries. But, the books upon horticulture, which were published, during the reign of Elizabeth, had made the *mulberry tree* sufficiently familiar to our poets, of every kind. Among several elegies on Sir Philip Sydney, there is a pretty poem, by Mathew Roydon, which was published, in *The Phoenix Nest*, in 1593, and which speaks of—

- “ Alcides speckled poplar tree,
- “ The palme that monarchs do obtain,
- “ With love juice stain'd the *Mulberie*,
- “ The fruit that dewes the poet's braine,
- “ And Phillis philbert there away,
- “ Compar'd with myrtle and the bay.”

The fact, however, is, that King James, in order to encourage the breeding of silk worms, sent circular letters all over England, in 1609 (g), to incite the inhabitants to plant the mulberry tree; These letters, probably,

(g) And. Com. vol. i. p. 472.

induced Shakspeare, while he was writing his *Coriolanus*, to draw a comparison, from what was already known to *graffers*, and to poets :

“ Now humble, as the ripest mulberry,

“ That will not hold the handling.”

NO. XXXI.—THE TEMPEST, 1613.

This drama is said to exhibit indubitable proofs of its being a late production: And, it was neither printed, nor entered in the Stationers' Registers, till the year 1623.

The severe tempests, which preceded the writing of this drama, are supposed by Mr. Malone, *from the authority* (*b*) of Howes, rather than of Stowe, to have suggested its name. There happened, say other contemporary accounts, “ a great tempest of thunder and lightening, on Christmas day, 1612 (*i*).” This intimation, necessarily, carries the writing of *The Tempest* into the subsequent year, since there is little probabi-

(*b*) Mal. Shak. vol. i. p. 379, which refers to Stowe's Chron. 913. This page should be 1002.

(*i*) Winw. Mem. 3 vol. 422.

lity,

lity, that our poet would write this enchanting drama, in the midst of the tempest, which overthrew so many mansions, and wrecked so many ships.

Whatever may have been the source, whence Shakspeare drew the fable of *the Tempest*, it is certain, that he derived some of the principal intimations, from contemporary publications: From Raleigh's *Discoverie* of the beautiful *Empire of Guiana*, which was published, in 1596, and which seems to have made a strong impression on our poet's mind, he, certainly, obtained his knowledge of the *still vexed Bermoothes* (k). From that period, the public attention was frequently drawn to this *isle of devils*, which was first colonized by a ship from the Thames, in 1612. This enterprize was followed, in the subsequent year, by a pamphlet, entitled, *A plane Description of the Bermudas, now called the Summer Islands* (l). A MS. of Vertue's, as the commentators remark, speaks of the representation of *the*

(k) *Apology*, p. 578. (l) *Apology*, 599.

Tempest, in the beginning of the year 1613. Ben Jonson, with unlucky malice, attempted to ridicule this noble effort of the great dramatist, in his *Barthomew Fair*, in 1614 (*m*). Add to those proofs, what I have formerly shown, by a variety of circumstances, that the allusion to the *dead Indian* in *the Tempest*, was warranted by the fact: For, five Indians were brought to this country from New England, in 1611; who were all carried away, in 1614, except *one*; and that one probably died, at London (*n*), in the intermediate period.

Such are the facts, and the circumstances, which have induced me to assign the epoch of *the Tempest* to the year 1613, instead of 1612, which the commentators had adopted, from weaker argumentation.

The measures, which were pursued, in 1612, for extending colonization in the new-world, upon a policy of disputable principle, were plainly ridiculed by Shakspeare (*o*).

(*m*) Steev. 1793, vol iii. p. 2.

(*n*) Apology, p. 585-6. (*o*) See Apology, 583-4.

He even struck at the foundation of European appropriation of American territories, by reason of the successive discoveries of European powers; when the poet deduced the right of King Stephano, in the following manner, which is as logical, as it is legal; 1st. Sycorax, the witch, was the prior possessor of the enchanted island, who left it to her son, Caliban; 2dly. Prospero, after reducing him to slavery, seized his inheritance; 3dly. Caliban reclaimed his rights, which he transferred to Stephano: 4thly. And, thereupon, Stephano became King of the *still vex'd Bermoothes*:

"These are not natural events: They strengthen

"From strange to stranger."

XXXIII.—TWELFTH NIGHT, 1613.

This play, which, in *the graver parts* is elegant and easy, and, in some of the lighter scenes, is exquisitely humorous, was neither entered in the Stationers' Registers, nor printed, till the publication of the first folio, in 1623.

It was supposed, by Mr. Tyrwhit, and
by

by Mr. Malone, from his suggestion, that *Twelfth Night* was written, in 1614; because it alludes to *Undertakers*, who were supposed to be reprobated, in the House of Commons, during the session of 1614: But, Mr. Ritson, to whose judgement, attention is due, doubts this application of the allusion to *Undertakers*; knowing that both *Takers*, and *Undertakers*, are often mentioned in the House of Commons, during other sessions, prior to that of 1614 (*p*). The fact is, that there were well known *Undertakers* for the plantation of Ulster; and that, on the 13th of April, 1611, King James issued a proclamation, requiring the British *Undertakers* to repair into Ireland, according to their contracts, for colonizing Ulster. In June 1613, the King being informed of the many delays, and abuses, touching this intended plantation, sent Sir Henry Montague, to the Lord Mayor, and citizens of London, who were the greatest *Undertakers* in that scheme, to

(*p*) See the Com. Journal, vol. i. during King James's parliaments.

put them in mind of their engagements: And the mayor and citizens, on Midsummer day, resolved, to send over proper persons, to fulfil their own engagements, and the King's wishes (*q*). These domestic events are sufficiently striking, to attract the special notice of a dramatist, who is noted for vigilance of observation.

In *Twelfth Night*, Shakspeare tried to effect, by ridicule, what the state was unable to perform by legislation. The duels, which were so incorrigibly frequent, in that age, were thrown into a ridiculous light by *the affair* between Viola, and Sir Andrew Aguecheek. Sir Francis Bacon had lamented, in the House of Comons, on the 3d of March, 1609-10, the great difficulty of redressing the evil of duels; owing to the corruption of man's nature (*r*). King James tried to effect what the Parliament had despaired of effecting; and, in 1613, he issued "An Edict and

(*q*) Howes' Chron. 1004, under the year 1613.

(*r*) Com. Journal, vol. i. p. 405. Franklyn's Annals, p. 5.

Censure against Private Combats (s),” which was conceived with great vigour, and expressed with decisive force; but, whether with the help of Bacon, or not, I am unable to ascertain. This is another remarkable event, in 1613, which the commentators have overlooked, though it may have caught Shakspeare’s eye.

In *Twelfth Night*, the Sophy of Persia is mentioned as a personage, who was, then, very familiar to an English audience: Fabian says, he would not give his part of the sport, in laughing at Malvolio, for a pension of thousands to be paid from *the Sophy*: And, Viola is said to have been fencer to the *Sophy*, in order to frighten Sir Andrew. In 1613, Sir Anthony Shirley published his travels into Persia; with his *dangers and distresses*, and his *strange, and unexpected deliverances* (t). Sir Robert Shirley, the brother of Sir Anthony, arrived, in

(s) It was printed, by Barker, the King’s printer, the same year.

(t) This narrative, was printed, in 4to. for Nat. Butter, and Joseph Dagfet.

October, 1611, as Ambassador from *the Sophy*; bringing with him a Persian Princess, as his wife. He remained here, through the whole of the year 1612, at an expence to King James of four pounds a day: and he departed in January, 1613 (u). From all those intimations, it seems, to me, that *Twelfth Night* was written, in 1613; while those various objects were in the eye, or in the recollection, of the public.

There is, moreover, an allusion to the picture of *Mol Cutpurse*, who did open penance, on the 11th of February, 1611-12. From *Deutromalia*, which was published, in 1609, Shakspeare, who is, continually, borrowing, what he is sure to repay with interest, adopted the scrap of a song, *Then three merry Men be we*. There is also a distant allusion to Dekker's *Westward Hoe*, which was exhibited, in 1607. These last

(u) In a letter from Chamberlain to Winwood, dated from London, on the 2d of January, 1612-13, it is said: "Sir Robert Shirley and his Persian lady are shipped away homeward, in a ship that goes to the East Indies." [Winw. Mem. 3 vol. 428.]

allusions

allusions only show the variety, and extent, of our poet's observations, and the copiousness of his common places, without giving an earlier epoch to *Twelfth Night*.

No. XXXIII.—HENRY THE EIGHTH, 1613.

There have been many diversities of opinion, among the Commentators, about the epoch of this splendid tragedy. These diversities have arisen, on this occasion, as it does at times, from self-sufficiency taking the direction of judgment, and substituting assertion for proof, conjecture for research, and assumption for argument.

Shakspeare may, indeed, have derived some intimations, when he sat down to write Henry VIII, as he did, on similar occasions, from prior poems, on the same subject. He had often perused, no doubt, Churchyard's *Legend of Cardinal Woolsey*, which was published in *The Mirror for Magistrates*, during the year 1587. He may have seen a poem, entitled *The Life and Death of Thomas Wolfey Cardinal*, which was

was entered in the Stationers' Registers, and published, in 1599. He, certainly, had seen the play, called *The Life and Death of Lord Cromwell*, which was published, at London, in 1602; and which was announced, in the title page, to have been written by W. S. He undoubtedly knew, that Rowley had published, in 1605, a drama, entitled *King Henry VIII*: And, these two last plays were both republished, in 1613, by the bookfellers, with the design, no doubt, that they should derive a special interest, from the passing scenes of the busy world. With his vigilance of observation, Shakspeare, undoubtedly, knew, that such things were. And, from all those circumstances, and presumptions, the Commentators, contrary to the most positive proofs, have fixed the year 1601, for the epoch of Henry VIII.

It is a fact, which several witnesses speak of, as a certainty, which can admit of no doubt, that the Globe Playhouse was burnt, on the 29th day of June, 1613, while the
play

play of *Henry VIII* was exhibiting (*).

“ But, Mr. Malone strongly suspects, that
 “ the only novelty attending this play, in
 “ the year 1613, was its title, its decora-
 “ tions, and perhaps the prologue, and
 “ epilogue.” On the other hand, Sir Henry
 Wootton, who lived, at the time, and knew
 what he *wrote*, does say, explicitly, that
 the Globe playhouse was burnt, during
 the exhibition of a *new* play, called, *All-is-*
true, which is acknowledged on the autho-
 rity of satisfactory evidence, to have been

(*) There is a letter in Winwood's Mem. vol. iii.
 p. 469, from John Chamberlain to Sir Ralph Winwood,
 dated from London, the 12th of July, 1613; in which
 letter it is said: “ But, the burning of the *Globe a Play-*
 “ *house*, on the *Bankside*, on *St. Peter's day*, cannot
 “ escape you; which fell out by a *peale of chambers*
 “ (that I know not on what occasion were to be used
 “ in the play) the *tappin*, or *stople* of one of them light-
 “ ing in the *thatch*, that covered the house; burned it
 “ down to the ground in less than two hours; and it
 “ was a great marvaile and fair grace of God that the
 “ people had so little harm, having but *two narrow doors*
 “ to get out.”

Henry

Henry VIII(y). Among accurate reasoners, the only question can be, whether we ought to believe the positive evidence of Sir Henry Wooton, who was an attentive spectator of what he relates, or Mr. Malone, who is groping in the dark, for what the noonday sun might have shown him. Such, then, is *the fact*, which fixes the writing of Henry VIII to 1613, in opposition to the *conjectures* of the Commentators.

There are, moreover, in the play, intimations of the time, which add *certainly* to *fact*. In the last scene, there is a compliment to King James, for his *policy of plantation*:

“ Wherever the bright sun of Heaven shall shine,
 “ His honour, and the greatness of his name,
 “ Shall be, and *make new nations*.”

This is admitted, by the Commentators, to be an allusion to the making of new na-

(y) The continuator of Stowe's Chronicle, Howes, who lived at the time, says expressly, that the play, which was then exhibited, was Shakspeare's Henry VIII. [Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 560. Mal. Shak. vol. i. pⁱ i. p. 337.]

tions beyond the Atlantic(z): And, it is said, by them, as a proof of their remark, that there was a *lottery* granted, in 1612, for promoting the Colony of Virginia, which was originally planted, in 1607, and not in 1606(a), as the Commentators have asserted. There was a *third* charter granted by King James, to the Virginia Company, on the 12th of March 1611-12, which included the *still vex'd Bermuthes*(b).

Yet; say the Commentators, in the face of fact, and probability, the allusion to

(z) Lord Bacon had a picture of King James, which came into the possession of Lord Grimston; whereon this *contemptible King*, says the spleen of Mr. Malone, is styled *imperij Atlantici conditor*. Mr. Steevens adopts this vulgarity of sentiment, and expression. [Shak. 1793, vol. xi. p. 203.]

(a) The first charter was granted in 1606; but the original colony was settled in 1607. [See Stith's Hist. of Virginia, p. 44—The epoch of this settlement is the 13th of May, 1607, p. 45.] The commentators say [Steev. vol. ii. p. 354] that the capital of *New England* was built in 1607, and called *James Town*: But, they should have said, the capital of *Virginia*.

(b) Stith's Hist. Appx. No. 3, one, or more, lottery, or lotteries, were granted by this charter.

King

King James's policy of plantation was a *subsequent insertion*: But, this is merely an assumption, without authority; and an assertion against proofs.

There is mention, in the last act, of a *strange Indian* come to court, which the Commentators allow "may perhaps hereafter serve to ascertain the date of this piece, though they had not been able to discover to what circumstance Shakspeare here alludes (c)." I, formerly, investigated this circumstance; and showed, from satisfactory evidence, that two vessels, which had been sent out to the New England Coasts, by Lord Southampton, and Sir Francis Gorges, returned to England, in 1611, with *five Indians* on board; that three of those Indians were carried back to their country, in 1614, one went upon the European Continent; and the *fifth* died in London, and was exhibited, as a show (d). There can be no doubt, but that one of

(c) Steev. Shak. 1793, vol. i. p. 559.

(d) Apology, 385-6.

those Indians is the Indian, who is mentioned by the porter in Shakspeare's Henry VIII. Is this, too, a *subsequent insertion*; or is it not rather a collateral circumstance, which proves the general position, that this play was written, in 1613?

In opposition to all those decisive facts, collateral circumstances, and fair inferences, the Commentators run out into general reasonings, which are, sometimes, founded on fictions, and, generally, grounded on *supposition*: But, what kind of logick is that, which argues against facts, which draws deductions against probability; and which assumes the point, that ought to be proved? Yet, these are the logicians, who, on other occasions, demand demonstrations in the affairs of life, and in the contests of literature! 1st. It is supposed (*e*), that Shakspeare was more likely to have written this Tragedy, in the reign of Elizabeth, than in the time of her successor. No: Shakspeare had too much prudence, if he had had the license

(*e*) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 554-5-6.

of the Master of the Revels, to bring the reigning Sovereign, as a public show, upon the open stage; her father's marriage, and her own baptism: Probability rejects such a supposition.—2dly. Would the poet write a panegyrick on Elizabeth, in the time of King James, “*who bated her memory?*” Yes: Shakspeare wrote what he knew would please *the million*, without thinking much about the court. It is a mere assumption against fact, that King James *bated the memory of Queen Elizabeth* (f).
3dly.

(f) See Dean Barlow's account of the conference at Hampton Court, 1604, p. 3-4: “King James spoke of the last Queen of *famous memory*, so his Highness added (for it is worth the noting, that his Majesty never remembreth her, but with some honourable addition.”) The commentators are so absurd as to say, from pure prejudice, that King James, on his accession to the throne, studiously marked his *disregard for Elizabeth*, by the favour, which he showed to Lord Southampton, and to every other person, who had been disgraced by her [on account of Essex's rebellion.] It is known to every one, except the commentators, that Sir Robert Cecil, the steady friend of Lord Southampton, kept a *secret correspondence* with King James, during

3dly. If it had been the poet's intention to make James the chief object in the last act, he would probably have given a short character of Elizabeth: But, we must take Shakspeare's Dramas, as we find them; without writing them, as the Commentators would have them to be written: The poet said what was fit to be said, both as to the matter, and the manner, during the King's reign. 4thly. If the Queen had been dead, the poet would have known more about her character, and circumstances: The truth is, that Shakspeare knew all, and said all, which he wished to say. 5thly. The poet has "cast the disagreeable parts" of her father's character as much into "shade as possible:" Why; was not King

some years, before the demise of Elizabeth; and guided that Prince, by the most prudent advice, to the throne; Cecil merited the highest commendation, and the greatest reward, for keeping the country quiet, during such a period; and preventing a civil war, from a disputed succession. The pardon of Essex's friends was, moreover, the popular act of a new reign, which affected to please all parties. [The secret correspondence of Cecil was published by Sir David Dalrymple, in 1766.]

James

James descended, directly, from the sister of Henry VIII; and was it not through her, that he derived his title to the crown? Lastly, it is said to be “unnecessary to
 “ quote particular passages in support of
 “ those *assertions*; but the following lines,
 “ which are spoken of Anne Boleyn, by
 “ the Lord Chamberlain, appear so evi-
 “ dently calculated for the ear of Eliza-
 “ beth, that I cannot forbear to transcribe
 “ them:”

“ She is a gallant creature, and complete

“ In mind and feature: I persuade me *from her*

“ *Will fall some blessing to this land, which shall,*

“ *In it, be memorized.*”

These lines were, no doubt, applied, directly, by the poet to Anne Boleyn, as the subject required: But, the same lines were applied, obliquely, by the audience to a very different lady, as Shakspeare foresaw. “ On the 14th of February, 1612-13,
 “ Frederick, Prince Palatine, of the Rhine,
 “ married the King’s daughter, the princess
 “ *Elizabeth*; and carried her over to Ger-

"many on the 10th of April (g)." Here, then, is the *complete creature*, from whom *some blessing* to this land was expected to be *memorized*. Well; was not Sophia, Dutchess Dowager of Hanover, the daughter of Elizabeth, Princess Palatine: And, have not the accession of the Hanover family, and the reign of his present Majesty, particularly, been blessings to this land; which, in it, have been *memorized*, in fulfilment of that prophecy?

We now perceive, from the fact, that there was a royal wedding, in April 1613: And, it is easy to infer, from it, that the poet, and the players, readily, determined to have a royal *Christening*, as an analagous show.

As there is, scarcely, an absurdity, that some philosophers have not maintained; so the commentators have, on this occasion, out-done themselves, in the absurdity of their reasonings: They would have us believe, that Ben Jonson, who was in perpetual hos-

(g) Brit. Chronologist, vol. i. p. 183.

tility with Shakspeare, made *adycious* to Henry VIII, and even wrote the prologue for our poet (*b*). What eye does not see the folly of supporting such suppositions, in opposition to probability, and in contradiction to common sense? I lament, that truth, and impartiality, should oblige me to include Johnson, and Farmer, in this reprobation. Far from having retired from the stage, as the commentators have supposed, Shakspeare wrote the *Tempest*, at the same epoch; and *Othello*, the greatest of his dramas, in a subsequent year. Tyrwhit, whose modesty, and knowledge, entitle him to unqualified praise, gave his vote, for fixing the epoch of Henry VIII, in 1613.

XXXV.—OTHELLO, 1614.

This great work, of an uncommon *maker*, is allowed, on account of its excellence, to have been one of his *latest performances*. It was neither entered in the Stationers' Registers, till the year 1621, nor printed, till

(*b*) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 561.

1622. When it was first written, the commentators have been unable to ascertain, either from the play itself, or from any contemporary production (i). Warburton, indeed, whose ingenuity was never at a loss for conjectures, thought, that there was an allusion, in *Othello*, to the order of baronets, which was created by King James, in 1611;

“ ——— The hearts of *old* gave hands,

“ But, our *new* heraldry is hands, not hearts.

Among other prerogatives, says Warburton, the baronets had an addition to their paternal arms of an *band gules*, in an escutcheon argent. Mr. Malone displays his heraldic knowledge, in confuting Warburton, who is partly right, and partly wrong. By what chymistry could this critic extract such a sense from such a passage? asks Mr. Malone. The answer must be, the same sort of chymistry, which so frequently enabled the observant dramatist to captivate the audience, by his striking allusions, to the passing scene; to satirize, without lampoon; and to throw out sarcasms, without scoffing. In the first scene of the

(i) Mal. Shak. vol. i. p. 376-8. Steev. 1778, vol. i. p. 339-40.

fourth act, Iago, working on the jealousy of Othello, artfully remarks: "If you are so fond over her iniquity, give her [a] *patent* to offend." The audience, who knew from their feelings, how much vexation had arisen from the *patents of monopoly*, which Queen Elizabeth, and King James, had so frequently granted, and so often retracted, must have been electrified by this fine stroke of well-timed satire. (k)

Mr. Malone, who allowed this *patent* specimen of Shakspeare's art, to glide unheeded by him, comments, in vain, on *heraldry*; on the name, and the thing: His diligence does not find another instance of our *new* heraldry, which Shakspeare satirized, specifically, in Othello. Warburton was right in supposing, that the stroke at the

(k) See the 1st vol. of the Commons Journal, for the constant endeavours of the House of Commons, without success, to abrogate the patents of monopoly, during the reigns of Queen Elizabeth, and King James. It was indeed impossible; if the law were, as Sir Francis Bacon stated it to that house; that if you make a penal statute, the Queen will dispense with it, and grant a patent with a *non obstante*

new heraldry was, incidentally, aimed at the creation of baronets, which was attended with uncommon circumstances. The epoch of this order was undoubtedly May, 1611: But, unluckily, for the speculation of Warburton, the additional armorial bearing, of the bloody hand, was not given by the patent of creation. The order had scarcely been created, when a dispute arose, during those punctilious times, about precedence, between the baronets, and the younger sons of viscounts, and barons. On this difficult point, King James sat *personally*, during three several days, to hear the learned counsel; to take the information of Heralds; and to consider the proofs: And, in the end, he decided against the baronets; declaring he had not had any purpose to wrong *third parties tacitly*, whatever he might intend to confer, by his creation, on others: But, the King, wishing to *ampliate* his favour towards the baronets, granted them, by a *second* patent, dated the 28th of May, 1612, among other *prebeminences*, “ *the arms of Ulster,* “ that is, in a field argent, a hand *geules*, or
“ *a bloudie*

“ a bloudie band (1).” Spenser will inform us, in his State of Ireland, “ that the bloody band is O’Neel’s badge.” Such, then, was the *new* heraldry, which Shakspeare played with; in order to please his audience! Yet, we see clearly, from the second patent, in 1612, that the epoch, which was assigned to Othello, in 1611, cannot be supported: And, we must, therefore, look for the true date, in some subsequent year.

The fact is, that the baronets had to encounter a feverer shock. A great noise was made in the House of Commons, on the 23d May, 1614, about the creation of Baronets. This clamour against the King’s

(1) There was printed, in a 4to. pamphlet, by Robert Barker, in 1612,—“ The decree and establishment of “ the King’s Majestie, upon a controversie of prece- “ dence between the younger sonnes of viscounts and “ barons, and the baronets.” See Selden’s Titles of Honour, 1614, p. 356-8; the 2d edition, 1631, p. 821-906. King James issued another specimen of his *new* heraldry, in 1613, “ on the succession of Prince Charles to the “ Dutchy of Cornwall, though he were not born *filius* “ *primogenitus*, as required by the statute of Edward “ the III^d.”

right

right to create such an order, was silenced in a committee. The baronets, amidst their apprehensions, might have cried out, "If the King be not the fountain of honours, what is he?" (*m*) There was, a few days before, a still louder outcry raised, in the House of Commons, with much greater cause, against patents of monopoly (*n*). Owing to those remarkable coincidences, and powerful reasons, I am of opinion, that Othello was written, in 1614; and, being written at this epoch, was the last, as it was one of the greatest, of his labours.

I am aware of an objection, which, if it were founded, would displace this tragedy from its order: For, Othello is said to have been acted, at Court, early in 1613 (*o*). A manuscript of Vertue is quoted for that position. I would bow to any register of the time; but, I will not allow Vertue, though a very diligent collector, to draw deductions

(*m*) Com. Journal, vol. i. p. 494.

(*n*) Ib. 490-2.

(*o*) Mal. Shak. vol. i. p. 378.

for me, which are to militate against the strongest probabilities. (p)

In this tragedy, Mr. Malone has made himself answerable for an amendment in the text, which Mr. Steevens has too readily admitted. The quarto edition of 1622, and the first folio, had erroneously printed Othello's speech:—

“ ——— And do undertake

“ *This* present wars against the Otomites.”

By not adverting to the context, the editors have amended the wrong word, *this*, instead of the word, *wars*: For Desdemona soon after pleads:

“ So that, dear Lords, if I be left behind,

(p) On making some inquiries, by a friend, what manuscript of *Vertue's* it were, which I saw so often quoted about scenic matters, Mr. Steevens, was so obliging as to say: “ The books, from which those
“ extracts were made, with several others lost, belonged
“ to secretary Pepys, and afterwards to Dr. Rawlinson,
“ who lent them to Mr. Vertue. There is a MS. note,
“ subjoined to the MSS. of Vertue, which, about thirty
“ years ago, were lent to Mr. Steevens by Mr. Gar-
“ rick.” Much is it to be lamented, that any MS. or
book, which furnished an illustration of Shakspeare;
and having once been seen, should ever disappear.

“ A moth

" A moth of peace, and he go to the war,

" The rites, for which I love him, are bereft me."

We thus perceive, that she speaks only of *one war*; the Duke had already spoken how " the Turk, with *a* most mighty preparation " makes for Cyprus;" and, in fact, there was only *one war* (*q*): So that the editors have only busied themselves to make the fault, which they did not find.

The Commentators have not been more happy in their remarks, on the well known tale of Othello:

" Wherein of *anters* vast, and *defarts* idle,

" It was my hint to speak:"

Among a thousand criticisms, I do not observe, that the Commentators have remarked, that Shakspeare, by no very uncommon quibble, has used the expressions, of *anters* vast and *defarts* idle, in one sense, when he meant also another. The progress of the word *anters* seems to be this: anters, aunter, aventers, adventures (*r*): and, hence, the word *an-*

(*q*) Nothing more was wanting, to make the text consistent and the grammar perfect, than to strike the letter (*s*) from the word (*wars*.)

(*r*) Percy's Rel. of An. Poetry. vol. ii. xlv-vi.

ters

ters came to signify, in the language of Yorkshire, *strange things*, or *strange stories* (s): So in a disputation *bytweene a Chrystens man and a Jew*, which was written before the year 1300:

Hur schull we longe abyde

Auntres [adventures] to hear. (t)

The play on *desarts idle* consists, in confounding *desart* for a *wildernefs*, with *desert*, for *merit*; and *deserts idle*, or unworthy desert might be deemed desert, *sine pulvere*.

I have now finished my apology to Mr. Steevens, for pretending to know any thing about the writings of Shakspeare, by performing, in twenty days, what he acknowledged his inability to perform, in twenty years: And, in making this apology, I have not only disputed Mr. Malone's chronology of Shakspeare's plays, but, I trust improved it; having formed such a new arrangement, as is more consistent with probability, and

(s) See the Clavis to the York. Dialogue, in its pure, natural, Dialect. 1684, p. 79.

(t) Warton's Hist. English Poetry, vol. ii. Amendments, sign. A. 2.

better supported by fact: I here submit, therefore, that arrangement to the judicious reader; having been governed, in making it, rather by the influence of moral certainty, than directed by any supposed necessity of fixing some of the dramas, to each year, according to the attempt of the original chronologist, who did not reflect that, "on our
 "quickest decrees, the inaudible and noise-
 "less foot of time steals, 'ere we can effect
 "them."

		<i>The Old Chronology.</i>	<i>The New Chronology.</i>
1.	The Comedy of Errors	- 1593	— 1591
2.	Love's Labours Lost	- 1594	— 1592
3.	Romeo and Juliet	- 1595	— 1592
4.	Henry VI, the First Part	- 1589	— 1593
5.	Henry VI, the Second Part	- 1591	— 1595
6.	Henry VI, the Third Part	- 1591	— 1595
7.	The Two Gentlemen of Verona	1595	— 1595
8.	Richard III	- - - 1597	— 1595
9.	Richard II	- - - 1597	— 1596
10.	The Merry Wives of Windsor	1601	— 1596
11.	Henry IV, the First Part	- 1597	— 1596
12.	Henry IV, the Second Part	- 1598	— 1597
13.	Henry V	- - - 1599	— 1597
14.	The Merchant of Venice	- 1798	— 1597
15.	Hamlet	- - - 1596	— 1597
16.	King John	- - - 1596	— 1598
			17. A Mid-

		<i>The Old Chronology.</i>	<i>The New Chronology.</i>
17.	A Midsummer's Night's Dream	1592	— 1598
18.	The Taming of the Shrew	— 1594	— 1598
19.	All's Well that Ends Well	— 1598	— 1599
20.	Much Ado about Nothing	— 1600	— 1599
21.	As You Like It	— 1600	— 1599
22.	Troilus and Cressida	— 1602	— 1600
23.	Timon of Athens	— 1609	— 1601
24.	The Winter's Tale	— 1604	— 1601
25.	Measure for Measure	— 1603	— 1604
26.	Lear	— 1605	— 1605
27.	Cymbeline	— 1605	— 1606
28.	Macbeth	— 1606	— 1606
29.	Julius Cæsar	— 1607	— 1607
30.	Anthony and Cleopatra	— 1608	— 1608
31.	Coriolanus	— 1610	— 1609
32.	The Tempest	— 1612	— 1613
33.	The Twelfth Night	— 1614	— 1613
34.	Henry VIII	— 1601	— 1613
35.	Othello	— 1611	— 1614

In making this attempt to settle, upon more solid ground, the chronology of Shakspeare's dramas, than has yet been done, I must plead, with the Commentators, that this subject does not pretend to the *certainties* of *demonstration* (u): Nothing more can be

(u) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 615.

expected, from such documents, on such a subject, than the conviction of *probability*. I trust, however, that in making this investigation, which was greatly facilitated, by the labours of my precursors, I have ascertained some new facts, and added some illustrative circumstances: And, I cannot help flattering myself, that the new chronology will be found, in the result, more consistent with probability than the old; which was compiled by Mr. Malone, with great research, and ingenuity, I confess; although his skill, and diligence, are less worthy of commendation, than the modesty, with which he transferred, in the end, “the slender portion of
 “praise that might result from the novelty of the undertaking, to some future
 “claimant.”

I will here subjoin, as an appropriate supplement to this apologetical section, such extracts from the entries of the Stationers' Registers, as serve to illustrate the chronology of Shakspeare's dramas. These extracts were first made, by Mr. Steevens, with great labour, and published by him
 with

with some boast; and they are now republished; in order to show his inaccuracies, even when he quotes a record: The text contains *the entries*; and the margin exhibits the errors of Mr. Steevens; consisting of the omissions of plays, of false dates, of wrong names, and of improper spellings.

The charter of the company of the Stationers was originally granted by Philip and Mary, on the 4th of May, 1556; and was confirmed by Elizabeth, in 1560(x). It is at the same time worthy of remark, that among the *Queen's Injunctions*, in 1559,

(x) Steev. 1793, vol. i. p. 422. It is herein said, that the first volume of the Company's Registers had been either lost, or destroyed. Mr. Malone was the first to announce, that this volume had been found. The fact is, as Mr. Greenhill, the Company's treasurer, assured me, that this volume was never lost: But, it was only not recognized, at the time; being without the distinguishing mark of A, on the back; nor, has it any mark upon its cover, to this day. I owe an acknowledgement of favour to the Company, for the inspection of their registers; my thanks to Mr. Chapman, the Stationer, of King's Street, for his interposition in my behalf; and a kindness to Mr. Greenhill, for his attentions,

there was an injunction “ against the printing of pamphlets, *playes* and *ballads* (y).” We may easily suppose, then, that though the entries of the stationers begin, on the 17th of July, 1576, there would not be many *playes*, and *ballads* entered, in the face of that injunction. The strictness of the rule was, however, somewhat relaxed, in 1599, when the prelates Whitgift, and Bancroft, decreed, that no *plays* should be printed, without the inspection, and permission, of the Archbishop of Canterbury, or the Bishop of London (z). Such, then, were the checks, which were thus imposed, by authority, either to prevent the printing of plays, or to secure their being printed, inoffensively.

I now proceed to give the extracts from the Stationers’ Registers, as they appear in the record :

1562.

Recevyd of Mr. Tottle for his *lycence* for pryntinge the tragicall History of the Ro-

(y) N° 51.

(z) Warton’s Hist. of Poetry, vol. iii. p. 488.

meus and Juliett with *Sonnetts*. (a)

A. fol. 86. a.

18 February 1582.

Mr. Totell] *Romeo and Juletta*. B. 193.—

5 Aug. 1596: Again, as a newe ballad (b),
for Edward White. C. 12. b.

[This, and the foregoing, are perhaps the
original work, [works,] on which Shak-
speare founded his play of *Romeo and*
Juliet.—Steevens.]

3d April 1592.

Edw. White] *The tragedie of Arden of*
feversham & blackwill

[This play was reprinted in 1770, at Fe-
versham, with a preface attributing it
to Shakspeare. The collection parallel
of passages, which the editor has
brought forward to justify his supposi-
tion, is such, as will make the reader
smile. The following is a specimen:
Arden of Feversham, p. 74:

“ Fling down Endimion, and snatch him up.”

(a) Receyvd for recevyd; licensẽ for lycence; son-
nettes for sonnetts.

(b) Ballet for ballad.

Merchant of Venice, Act 5, Sc. 1:

"Peace, ho! the moon sleeps with Endymion."

Arden of Feversham, p. 87:

"Let my death make amends for all my sins."

Much Ado about Nothing, Act 4, Sc. 2:

"Death is the fairest cover for her shame."

[Steevens.]

18 April 1593.

Rich^d Feild] Entered as his Copy, licensed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Wardens, a book, intituled Venus and Adonis: Assigned over to Mr. Harrison, sen. 25 June 1594.—297-b. It was also entered by Harrison, sen. on the 25th of June; by W. Leake, the 25th of June 1596; by W. Barret the 16th of February 1616; and by John Parker on the 8th March 1619 (c).

19 Oct. 1593.

Symon Waterfon] a booke intituled the Tragedye of Cleopatra. (d) 301. b.

(c) Field for feild; entitled for intituled; 23d June for 25th June.

(d) Tragedie for tragedye.

[I sup-

[I suppose this to be Daniel's tragedy of Cleopatra: Simon Waterfon was one of the printers of his other works.

Steevens.]

[Daniel's *Cleopatra* was published by Waterhouse, in 1594; this Entry, therefore, undoubtedly related to it. Malone.]

6 Feb. 1593.

John Danter] A booke entitled a noble Roman Historye of Tytus Andronicus. (e)

304. b.

Entered also unto him, by Warrant from Mr. Woodcock, the ballad thereof.

12 March 1593.

Tho. Millington] A booke intituled the firste parte of the contention of the twoo famous Houses of York and Lancaster, with the Deathe of the good Duke Humphrey and the Banishment and Deathe of the Duke of *Sufk* and the tragicall Ende of the *prowd* Cardinall of Winchester, with the notable rebellion of Jack Cade

(e) History for historye; Titus for Tytus.

and

and the Duke of York's first clayme unto
the Crowne (*f*). 305. b.

2 May 1594.

Peter Shorte] A booke intituled, a plesant
conceyted hystorie called the Tayminge
of a shrowe (*g*). 306. b.

[I conceive it to be the play, that fur-
nished Shakspeare with the materials,
which he afterwards worked up into
another with the same title. Steevens.]

9 May 1594.

Mr. Harrison Sen.] A booke intituled the
Ravysbement of Lucrece (*h*). 306. b.

14 May 1594.

Tho. Creede] A booke intituled the famous
Victories of Henrye the ffyft conteyninge
the honorable Battell of Agincourt (*i*).
306. b.

(*f*) intituled for intituled; first for firste; Humphrie
for Humphrey; Yorke for Sufk; proude for proud;
Yorke's for York's; claime for clayme; crown for crowne.

(*g*) Pleasaunt for plesant.

(*h*) Ravysbement for ravysbement.

(*i*) Strode for Creede; 12th for 14th; intituled for in-
tituled; Henry for Henrye; fift for ffyft; containing for
conteyninge.

[This

[This may have been the very displeasing play mentioned in the Epilogue to the second part of Henry IV. Steevens.]

[The earliest Edition of this play now known to be extant, was printed in 1598. Of this Edition I have a Copy. This piece furnished Shakspeare with the outline of the two parts of Henry IV, as well as with that of Henry V. Malone.]

14 May 1594.

Edw. White] A booke entituled the *moste* famous Chronicle historye of Leire Kinge of England and his three Daughters (*k*).

307.

[I suppose this to be the play on the same subject as that of our author, but written before it. Steevens.]

22 May 1594.

Edw. White] A booke entituled a Wynters nightes Pastime (*l*). 307. b.

[Query, If the Winter's Tale. Steevens.]

(*k*) *Moste* is left out; *historie* for *historye*; King for Kinge.

(*l*) *Intituled* for *entituled*; *winter* for *wynters*; *nyghts* for *nightes*.

19 June

19 June 1594. Tho. Creede] An enterlude intituled the Tragedie of Richard the Third, wherein is sh~~own~~ the Death of Edward the Fourthe, with the Smotheringe of the twoo Princes in the Tower with *a* lamentable End of Shore's wife and the coniunction of the twoo Houses of Lancaster and York (*m*).

309. b. [This could not have been the work of Shakspeare, as the death of Jane Shore makes no part of his Drama.—Steevens.]

20 July 1594. Tho. Creede] The lamentable Tragedie of Locrine the eldest Sonne of K. Brutus, discoursing the warres of the Brittans, &c (*n*). 310. b. vol. C.

1 Dec. 1595. Cuthbert Burby] A booke intituled Edward the Third and the black prince, their

(*m*) Entitled for intituled; sh~~own~~ for sh~~own~~; *the* for *a*; contention for coniunction; two for twoo.

(*n*) Son for sonne; Britains for Brittans.

warres

warres with Kinge John of Fraunce(o).

C. 6.

[This is ascribed to Shakspeare by the compilers of ancient catalogues. Steevens.]

5 Aug. 1596.

Edw. White] A newe ballad of Romeo and Juliett(p).

12. b.

[Query, If Shakspeare's play, the first edition of which appeared in 1597. Steevens.]

15 Aug. 1597.

Rich. Jones] Two ballads, beinge the *ffirste* and second parts of the Widowe of Watling-streete; provided that no Draper's name be set to them(q).

22. b.

[Perhaps the songs on which the play with the same title was founded. It may, however, be the play itself. It was not uncommon to divide one dra-

(o) Booke for book; intituled for intituled; B for b; P for p; King for Kinge; France for Fraunce.

(p) New for newe.

(q) Being for beinge; *first* for *ffirste*; street for streete.

matic piece, though designed for a single exhibition, into two parts. See the King John before that of Shakspeare. Steevens.]

29 Aug. 1597.

Andrew Wise] The Tragedye of Richard the Seconde. 23.

20 Oct. 1597.

Andrew Wise] The Tragedie of Kinge Richard the Third, with the death of the Duke of Clarence (r). 25.

25 Feb. 1597-8.

Andrew Wisse] A booke intituled the Historye of Henry the iiiiith, with his battaile at Shrewsburye against Henry Hottspurre of the North with the conceived Mirth of Sir John Falstaffe (s). 31.

22 July 1598.

James Robertes] A booke of the Marchaunt of Venyee, or otherwise called the Jewe

(r) King for Kinge; death for death.

(s) Wise for wisse; entitled for intituled; historie for Historye; battle for battaile; Shrewsbury for Shrewsburye; North for North; Falstoff for Falstaffe.

of

of Venyfe. Provided that *yt* bee not
 prynted by the said James Robertes or
 anye other whatsoever, without *lycence*
 first had from the right honourable the
 Lord Chamberlen (*t*). 39. b.

27 May 1600.

To Mr. Roberts] My Lord Chamberlen's
 mens plaies entred viz. A Morall of
 Clothe breches and velvet hose: 24 May,
 to hym. Allarum to London.

4 August.

As you like *yt*. a book. Henry
 the *ffift*. a book. *Every man*
in his humor. a book. *The* } To be staied
 Comedie of Much Adoo about
 nothinge, a book (*u*).
 [Probably the play before that of Shak-

(*t*) Roberts for Robertes; merchaunt for marchaunt;
 Venyfe for Venyce; or, after Venyce, is left out; *it*
 for *yt*; *be* for *bee*; any for anye; *leave* for *lycence*; *ryght*
 for right.

(*u*) Mr. Steevens has *it* for *yt*; *fift* for *ffift*; he has
 left out altogether, one play, viz. *Every Man in his Hu-*
mor, a book; he has left out *The*; he has comedy for
 comedie; *ado* for *adoo*; nothing for nothinge.

speare,

speare, says Mr. Steevens: But, Mr. Malone remarks: "Surely this must have been Shakspeare's *Henry V*, which as well as *Much Ado about Nothing*, was printed in 1600, when this entry appears to have been made: See the Essay on the Chronological order of Shakspeare's plays; Article, *As you Like it*."—I concur with Mr. Malone; because the entry adds, that all those books were said to be, *My Lord Chamberlen's men's plaies*. It was, doubtless, 1600: These Entries seem to have been, merely, omitted in their proper places.]

11 August 1600.

Tho Pavier] First parte of the History of the Life of Sir John Oldcastell Lord Cobham. Item, The Second, *and last* parte of the History of Sir John Oldcastell Lord Cobham, with his Martyrdom (x). 63.

(x) In the date, 4th for 11th; Pavyer for Pavier; *and last* are left out; part for parte; *Oldcastle* for *Oldcastell*.

14 Aug.

14 Aug. 1600.

Thos. Pavyer] The Historye of Henrye the
Vth with the battel of Agencourt(y). 63.

23 Aug. 1600.

And. Wife Wm. Aspley] Two books, the
one called *Muche Adoe* about *Nothings*;
and the other The second Parte of the
History of Kinge Henry the iiith; with
the *Humors* of Sir John Fallstaff: wrytten
by Mr. Shakespeare(z). 63. b.

8 Oct. 1600.

Tho. Fysher] A booke called a *Mydsomer*
nights Dreame(a). 65. b.

28 Oct. 1600.

Tho. Haies] The booke of the Merchant
of Venyce(b). 66.

(y) Henry for Henrye; *fifth* for Vth; B for b; Agin-
court for Agencourt; nor, is there an *etc.* after Agen-
court, in the Register.

(z) *Much* for *muche*; *ado* for *adoe*; *nothing* for *no-*
things; King for Kinge; *fourth* for iiith; *humours* for
Humors; Fallstaff for Fallstaff; written for wrytten.

(a) *Fisher* for *Fysher*; *midsummer* for *mydsomer*; *nyghts*
for *nights*.

(b) *Hayes* for *Haies*; *A booke called* are not in the Re-
gister; *Merchaunt* for Merchant.

18 Jan. 1601-2.

John Busby] An excellent and *pleasant* conceited *Commedie* of Sir John Faulstof, and the Merry wyves of Windefor (c). 78.

Arth. Johnson] By assign'. from Jn°. Busbye a B. An excellent and pleasant conceited comedie of Sir John Faulstafe & the mery wyves of Windsor. *ibid.*

19 April 1602.

Tho. Pavier] by Assign'. from Tho. Milington *Salvo jure cujuscumq.* The 1st. and 2d. pts. of Henry the VI: 11 books (d).

Tho. Pavier] Titus *and* Andronicus, entered by warrant under Mr. Setons hand (e). 80. b.

26 July 1602.

James Roberts] A booke, The Revenge of Hamlett prince of Denmarke, as yt was

(c) Pleasaunt for pleasant; comedie for comedie; Faulstoff for Faulstof; Windfore for Windefor.

(d) The entry of the 1st and 2d parts of Henry VI is compleatly left out by Mr. S.

(e) The words, *A booke called*, are not in the Register, and the copulative *and* is left out between Titus and Andronicus.

latelic

latelie acted by the Lord Chamberlayn
his servantes (*f*). 84. b.

11 Aug. 1602.

Wm. Cotton] A booke, called the Lyfe
and Deathe of the Lord Cromwell, as yt
was lately acted by the Lord Chamber-
leyne his servants (*g*). 85. b.

7 Feb. 1602-3.

Mr. Roberts] The booke of Troilus and
Cressida, as yt is acted by my Lo. Cham-
berlens men (*h*). 91. b.

27 June 1603.

Math. Lawe] in full Courte iij Enterludes
or playes The first is of Richard the 3d.
The second of Richard ye 2d. The third
of Henry the 4, the first pte. all Kings (*i*).
98.

(*f*) *It* for *yt*; lately for latelie; Chamberlain for
Chamberlayn; servantes for servants.

(*g*) *Death* for *deathe*; Chamberleyne for Chamber-
leyne; servantes for servants.

(*h*) *Cressida* for *Cresseda*; *it* for *yt*.

(*i*) In the date, 25 for 27th.

12 Feb. 1604-5.

Nath. Butter] *If* he get good allowance for the Enterlude of K. Henry 8th. before he *begyn* to print it; and then procure the wardens *hands* to yt for the entrance of yt: he is to have the same for his copy (*k*). 120.

[This was a play entitled, When you see me you know me, or the famous Chronicle Historie of K. Henrie the eight &c. by Samuel Rowley. Printed for N. Butter 1605. Malone.]

8 May, 1605.

Simon Stafford] A booke called the tragicall Historie of Kinge Leir and his three Daughters &c. as yt was lately acted (*l*). 123.

John Wright] By assignment from Simon Stafford and consent of Mr. Leake the tragicall History of Kinge *Leire*, and his *three Daughters* provided that S. S. [Si-

(*k*) *That*, mistakingly, for *yf*; the *K.* is left out before Henry; begin for *begyn*; *hand* for *hands*:

(*l*) King for Kinge; the *&c.* after daughters is left out; it for yt; lately for *latelie*.

mon

mon Stafford] shall have the printing of
this book (*m*). *ibid.*

[This is the *King Lear* before that of
Shakspeare. Steevens.]

3 July, 1605.

Tho. Pavyer] A ballad of lamentable mur-
ther done in Yorkeshire by a Gent. upon
2 of his owne Children, fore woundinge
his Wyfe and Nurse (*n*). 126.

[Query, if the play—Steevens.]

22 Jan. 1606-7.

Mr. Linge] By direction of a Court and
with consent of Mr. Burby under his
hand wrytinge these iij copies, viz. Ro-
meo & Juliett. Loves labour Loste. 3,
The taminge of a shrewe (*o*). 147.

(*m*) *Lear* for *Leire*; and he has an &c. for *and his*
three daughters.

(*n*) In the Register there is no *a*, before lamentable;
murder for murther; wife for wyfe; and there ought to
be no &c. at the end.

(*o*) *Nich.* for *Mr.*; *Lost* for *Loste*; taming for
taminge.

6 Aug. 1607.

Geo. Elde] Entered for his Copie under
th'ands of Sir Geo. Bucke, Knight, and
the wardens, A booke called the Come-
die of the Puritan wydowe(*p*). 157. b.

6 Aug. 1607.

Tho. Thorp] Entered for his Copie under
'thands of S'Geo. Bucke Kt. and wardens,
A Comedie called, What you Will(*q*).

ibid.

[Perhaps this is Marston's Comedy of
What you Will. I have a Copy of it,
dated 1607. *What you Will*, however,
is the second title to Shakspeare's
Twelfth Night—Steevens.—But, Mr.
Malone adds; This was certainly,
Marston's play; for it was printed in
1607 by G. Elde for T. Thorpe.]

22 Oct. 1607.

Ar. Johnson] Entered as his Copie under
'thands of Sir Geo. Bucke, Kt. and the
wardens, a plaie called, The merry De-
vill of Edmonton. 159. b.

(*p*) Widowe for Wydowe.

(*q*) Comedy for Comedie.

[The

[*The merry Devil of Edmuntton* is mentioned in the *Black Booke* by T. M. 1604: Give him leave to see *The merry Divel of Edmuntton, or a woman killed with kindnesse*.—Steevens.]

19 Nov. 1607.

John Smythick] Under t'hands of the wardens, the books following, which did belong to Nichos Lynge. 6 a booke called Hamlett. 9 The Taminge of a Shrewe. 10 Romeo & Julett. 11 Loves Labour Lost (r). 161.

26 Nov. 1607.

Na. Butter and Jo. Busby] Entered for their Copie under t'hands of Sir Geo. Bucke, Kt. and the Wardens, a booke called, Mr. Willm Shakespeare, his Historye of Kinge Lear, as yt was played before the King's Majestie at Whitehall, upon St. Stephen's night at Christmas last, by his Majestie's Servants playing usually at the Globe on the Bank-side (s). 161. b.

(r) Smythwick for Smythick.

(s) William for Willm; Historie for Historye; King for Kinge; it for yt.

5 April 1608.

Joseph Hunt and Tho. Archer.] A book called the lyfe and deathe of the Merry Devill of Edmonton, with the pleasant Pranks of Smugge the Smyth, Sir John and myne Hoste of the George, about their stealinge of Venfon—By T. B. (t).
165. b.

[Bound up in a volume of plays attributed to Shakspeare, and once belonging to King Charles II; but now in Mr. Garrick's collection. The initial letters at the end of this entry, sufficiently free Shakspeare from being its author. —Steevens.]

2 May 1608.

Mr. Pavyer] A booke, *The Yorkshire Tragedy*, written by Wylliam Shakespere (u).
167.

20th May, 1608.

Edw. Blunt] Entered under t'hands of Sir

(t) Life for lyfe; death for deathe; devil for devill; smugg for smugge; Smith for Smyth, mine for myne; venifon for venfon.

(u) A for *The*; Shakespere for Shakespere.

Geo.

Geo. Bucke, Kt. and Mr. Warden Seton,
a booke called: The booke of Pericles
Prynce of Tyre (x). 167. b.

A booke by the like authoritie called Anthony
and Cleopatra, ibid.

28 Jan. 1608-9.

Rich. Bonion and Hen. Whalleys] Entered
for their copie under t'hands of Mr.
Segar Deputy to Sir Geo. Bucke, and
Mr. Warden Lownes: A booke called,
the History of Troylus and Cressida (y).
178. b.

20th May 1609.

Tho. Thorpe] A booke called, Shakespeare's
Sonnetts (z). 183. b.

16 Oct. 1609.

Mr. Welby] Edward the Third 189.
16 Dec. 1611.

John Brown] A booke called the Lyfe and
Death of the Lo. Cromwell, by W. S.
214. b.

(x) In the date, the 2d for the 20th; Prince for
Prynce.

(y) Bonian for Bonion; Whalley for Whalleys; Cressida for Cressida.

(z) Sonnets for sonnetts.

29th Nov.

29th Nov. 1614.

John Beale] A booke called the History of George Lord Faulconbridge bastard Sonne to Richard Cordelion (a). 256. b.

[Query. If this was Shakspeare's *King John*, or some old Romance, like that of *Richard Coeur de Lion*. Steevens.]

To this Mr. Malone answers: It was undoubtedly the famous historie of George Lord Fauconbridge, a prose Romance. I have an edition of it now before me, printed for J. B. dated 1616.]

16th Feb. 1616.

Mr. Barrett] Life and Death of Lord Cromwell. 279.

2 March 1617.

Mr. Snodham] Edward the Third, the play (b). 288.

17 Sept. 1618.

John Wright] The comedy called Mucedorus 293. b.

(a) Historie for History; *George* is left out before Lord Faulconbridge; *son* for *sonne*.

(b) In the date, the 20th for the 2d.

[Bound

[Bound up in a volume of plays attributed to Shakspeare, and once belonging to King Charles II. See Mr. Garrick's collection. Steevens.]

8 July 1619.

Lau. Hayes] A play called the Marchaunt of Venice (c) 303. V. D.

6 Oct. 1621.

Tho. Walkely] Entered for his, to wit, under the handes of Sir George Buck, and the Wardens: The Tragedie of Othello, the Moore of Venice 21

8 Nov. 1623.

Mr. Blounte and Isaak Jaggard] Mr. William Shakspeare's Comedyes, Histories, and Tragedyes, foe many of the said copies, as are not formerly entered to other men. viz.

Comedyes	{	The Tempest.
		Two Gentlemen of Verona.
		Measure for Measure.
		The Comedy of Errors.

(c) *Nich. Okes for Lau. Hayes; Merchaunt for Marchaunt.*

As

Comedyes	{	As You Like it.	
		All's Well that Ends Well.	
		Twelfth Night.	
		The Winter's Tale.	
Histories	{	The Thirde Parte of Henry	
		the Sixt,	
		Henry the Eight.	
Tragedies	{	Coriolanus.	
		Timon of Athens.	
		Julius Cæsar.	
		Macbeth	
		Anthony and Cleopatra.	
	{	Cymbeline (<i>d</i>).	69 a.

14 Dec. 1624.

Mr. Pavier] Titus Andronicus, Widdow
of Watling Street (*e*). 93

23 Feb. 1625.

Mr. Stansby] Edward the Third, the play,
115

(*d*) Blount for Blounte; Shakespeare's for Shakespeare's; *Histories* left out after comedyes; tragedies for tragedyes; *third* for *thirde*; *part* for *parte*; Macbeth for Macbeth.

(*e*) Payver for Pavier; Andronicus for Andronicus; widow for widdow.

3 April

3 April 1626.

Mr. Parker] Life and Death of Lord Crom-
well 120

4 Aug. 1626.

Edw. Brewster] Mr. Pavier's right in Shake-
speare's plays

Rob. Birde] or any of them.

*The Historie of Hen. the fift, and the play of
the same.* Sir John Oldcastle a play.
Tytus and Andronicus — Historie of
Hamblett (f). 127

29 Jan. 1629.

Mr. Meighen.] *The Merry Wives of Win-
for* (g). 193

8 Nov. 1630.

Ric. Cotes] Assigned unto him by Mr.
Bird and consent of a full Court: Henrye
the Fift. Sir John Oldcastle. Tytus
and Andronicus. Yorke and Lancaster.

(f) Pavyer's for Pavier's; our editor has left out,
after any of them, *The Historie of Hen. the fift, and the
play of the same*; Titus for Tytus; and is left out after
Tytus; Historie for Historie.

(g) *The* is left out before Merry; Windsor for Win-
for.

Agincourt.

Agincourt. Pericles. Hamblet. Yorkshire Tragedie (*b*). 208
 Mr. Blount assigned unto Mr. Allott] The sixteen plays in p. 69, were assigned by Tho. Blount to Edward Allott, June 26, 1630 (*i*). 109

[Edward Allott was one of the publishers of the second folio 1632. Steevens].

I will only beg leave to add, in Mr. Steevens's own words, when he finished his Extracts from the Stationers' Registers, erroneous as they were, "The public is
 " now in possession of as accurate an ac-
 " count of the dates, &c. of Shakspeare's
 " Works, as perhaps will ever be com-
 " piled : " And, I will now close this Apology, with remarking that, in Editorship, as it often is,

" ——— in religion ;

" What damned error, but some sober brow

" Will blest it."

(*h*) *And* is left out after *Tytus* ; *Hamblet* for *Hamblet* ; *Yorkshire tragedy* for *Yorkshire tragedie*.

(*i*) The year 1632 is put, mistakingly, for 1630.

§ XIII.

THE POSTSCRIPT, ADDRESSED TO T. J. MATHIAS,
F. R. S. S. A. THE AUTHOR OF THE PURSUITS OF
LITERATURE, &c. &c. &c.

IN the midst of this controversy, which had, for its end, the repulsion of attack, and the defence of truth, you mingled in the fray, without either the pretension of injury, or the prospect of good: You came out monkey-like, *to reform literature*, at whatever hazard of mischief, or certainty of wrong: And, like a true monkey-critic, you censured a book, which you had never read; and of which, the perusal might have protected you, at least, from the charge of ignorance, if not saved you, from the disgrace of blunder. But you would, in an unlucky moment for your own fame, “make *satire a lampoon* ;” and point the finger of malice :—

“ See on the critic in “ his pride of place,”

“ Laborious Chalmers drops his leaden mace (a).”

In

(a) I complain not of your couplet; as I claim no exemption from the common fate of every writer, who
offers

In this weapon, I suspect, Mr. Malone has found the toughness of iron; and in it, you will find, I trust, the sharpness of steel. This couplet was, no doubt, deemed wonderfully witty, and it will hereafter be regarded, perhaps, as vastly wise, to rouse an offenceless mastiff, while reposing in the shade, after a successful conflict. You have, however, your subterfuges always at hand:

“My *hate* was great with child; and here ’tis eas’d;

“Vex’d all the world, so that *myself* be pleas’d.”

offers to the public either amusement, or information. Any verse-man is perfectly welcome to *hitch me into rhyme*, either in a couplet, or a triplet, if he see any thing ridiculous, in my productions: But, I perceived in your prose note, which was not called for, an obvious purpose of personal insult. “Nay, Sir,” cry you, in your common cant, “have not I added to this prose “note, in a subsequent edition, that you are a man “of *great learning*; and do you not deem this a sufficient apology from so great a writer, as the author of “the Pursuits of Literature.” No, Sir, I consider that addition, being in your usual style of attempting ridicule by the mixture of contradictory qualities, as an aggravation of the original impertinence.

“But,

“ But, Sir, Sir,” say you “ have I roused
 “ the mastiff ?” “ Am I the author of the
 “ Pursuits of Literature ?” “ Have not I
 “ denied my being the writer of it, and
 “ desired booksellers to tell the world, that
 “ I am not the author of a book, which
 “ the greatest scholar ought to be proud to
 “ own ?” Yes : You have made such de-
 nials ; and you have made a similar denial
 to your official superior : But you have made
 all those denials, with such circumstances
 of tergiversation, as to prove the affirmative
 of the question. You convinced some of
 the booksellers, that you were the true
 writer, by your dubious manner of speaking
 to them, upon the point ; neither positive-
 ly directing a denial, nor yet clearly per-
 mitting an avowal of the charge. When
 you were advertised, as the author, week
 after week, by a person, who, knowing the
 fact, sent his name to the publisher of the
 newspaper, did you, on that occasion, dis-
 avow your being the author of that lampoon,
 as publicly, as you had been pointedly
 charged ? No : But, you ought to have

K k

made

made such a disavowal, if you had considered your situation, in the Queen's Treasury; having lampooned the King's person; having committed a breach of privilege of both Houses of Parliament; and having ridiculed the two learned Societies. Nay; have I not, repeatedly, declared, in my *Pursuits of Literature*, "that I never will be "known (*b*);" conscious, you might have added, that I have kept my own secret, as faithfully as *Junius*, whom time only has at length discovered: Time, which has very soon disclosed your tricks. Let me, however, ask with Marston, one of the first and best of our satirists:

"Tell me, Mathias, hast thou Gyges' ring,
"That thou presum'st, as if thou wert unseen?"

I propose, in the first place, to submit to the inquisitive reader the evidence, which

(*b*) You again declare "that neither my name, nor "my situation in life, will ever be revealed." And, putting yourself in the threatening posture of *ancient Pistol*, you cry out, that, "it will be *more than foolish* to conjecture about the author." [Pur. Lin. 7 Ed. p. 226-7-8.]

I have

I have collected, for proving you to be the real author of *The Pursuits of Literature*; 2dly. to treat of the matter of your work; and, lastly, to speak of the manner of it; constantly adducing facts, examples, and documents, as the proofs of my positions; in order to satisfy the most sceptical, and to convince the most incredulous. Whatever you may say, or others may think, I shall consider that to be the best logick, which establishes every proof, with such elaboration, as to preclude an answer; and that to be the best writing, which enforces conviction, by the strength of its argument, and shortens controversy, by the efficacy of its vigour. Neither do I feel any great apprehensions of your repeated *threats* of “a *darkness* that may be felt.” For, whatever may be the danger of that *darkness*, I am determined to

“Be stirring as the time; be fire with fire;

“*Threaten the threatener*; and out-face the brow

“Of *bragging horror*.”

I. PROOFS of *your* being the AUTHOR.

I am neither so absurd myself, as to attempt to give, nor so foolish, as to approve of the absurdity of others, who demand, *demonstration*, in the contests of literature, or in the affairs of life: All, then, that can be fitly offered, or fairly required, in such cases, is, such evidence, as the nature of the subject admits, or the constitution of the mind demands.

Such is the common sense, which has always prevailed in this land: And, hence, it is, accordingly, an established principle of the common law to admit one witness, as quite sufficient, to prove any particular fact; if he be a credible person (*c*). The writing of a book, or the publication of a libel, are facts, which any one witness, who knows the truth, is competent to prove. And, in the daily practice of Westminster-hall, nothing more is necessary than to bring, as a witness, the person who bought the libel;

(*c*) Such was the judicial opinion of the Lord Chief Justice Holt. [Bac. Ab^t Ed. Guillim, vol. ii. p. 593.]

in order to prove the fact of publication. If this, then, be true, in common sense, in common law, and in common practice, nothing more is requisite, than to produce the bookseller, who sold the first part of *The Pursuits of Literature*, and who, as you busied yourself in the sale, and celebration of the work, made no great scruple to say, that you were the person, who sent the copy, and corrected the press, although you skulked behind Macrae, your printer. Thus easy is it to prove you *the publisher* of the lampoon in question. Your friends, knowing what had been said, on this head, which could be proved, and what you had yourself disclosed, admit, that you were *the publisher*. But, they deny, that you are *the Author*; declaring your talents to be unequal to the task of writing the omniscient *Pursuits of Literature*.

It must be acknowledged, indeed, that the publisher of a book may not be the author of it: Cleland was the putative publisher of Pope's lampoons. But, your pride has never stooped to be the *Cleland* of any

poet: You had published such writings, for yourself, before; but not for others: And, you had already sent into the world similar lampoons, either to indulge the evil habits of malice, or to gratify the selfish passion of vanity. Yes:

“You can add guilt to vanity, and take
 “A pride to hear the conquests, which you make.”

It is fair to presume, then, that being, certainly, the publisher, you are, probably, the author. I would even undertake to carry this probability into moral certainty: If justice called on me, for the proofs, I would produce your first bookseller, to prove you the publisher; your printer to prove, that you corrected the sheets from the press; and your last bookseller, to confirm the testimony of both. I would produce a third bookseller to prove, that he had told you some anecdotes, which he soon saw, in your next edition. I would produce a fourth bookseller, who lent you several books, which, he perceived in your next publication, quoted as authorities. If I were hard pressed for witnesses, I would produce several

ral ladies, to whom you confessed, and denied, and denied, and confessed, that you claimed the honour of writing "the omniscious and omnisufficient" *Pursuits of Literature*: Junius, MacAulay, kept his secret from his wife: You let several women into your secret, with the policy of concealing, and, at the same time, revealing, your secret. Yet, though many witnesses may be produced, one witness is quite sufficient, to prove the fact, either of publishing, or of writing, any book, in the judicial practice of our rational tribunals. I perceive, that this appeal to jurisprudence makes you exclaim, in the characteristic tone of the *Preface* to your *Translation*:

" The king-becoming graces;

"As justice, verity, temperance, staidness,

"I have no relish of them!

Let me add to these proofs, a fact, which may produce conviction in the minds of all those enquirers, who are either unable, or unwilling, to take the trouble of pursuing a train of probabilities: I have perused some of your private letters, which were written,

not in your elongated hand, for the purpose of deception, but in your usual character, for common concerns; In these epistles, I have seen your *likes*, and *dislikes*, which have enabled me to judge of your real motives, either for praise, or for blame; and, bearing in my recollection, the previous probabilities of your being the author, I was furnished by these letters, with as complete proof, as if

“ ——— Spirits that know

“ All mortal consequences had pronounced it.”

It is an observation of Dr. Beattie (*d*), when speaking of the style of the Scripture, “ that there are no remarks thrown in, to anticipate objections; nothing of that caution, which never fails to distinguish the testimony of those, who are conscious of imposture.” If these observations be as true, as they are judicious, and profound, a contrary conduct, in any writer, must establish a quite different inference: Your *Pursuits* are full of such *anticipations*, which are guardedly inserted, for the obvious purposes

(*d*) In his Evidence of the Truth of Christianity, vol. i. p. 79.

of

of answering objections, and deluding inquiry. When you are in the act of ridiculing the Royal Society, whereof *you are a fellow*, you say, " Sometimes, *as I was told*, " the idea of the cruelty exercised upon " these animals is lost, in the *ridiculous* " term, *My friend told me*, that he actually " thought, &c." (e) When you are ridiculing the Antiquary Society, whereof you are also a member, you say, " *I am obliged* " *for this information* to a fellow of the S. of " Antiquaries;" (f) Yet, the fact is, that you were present at the memorable election of Mr. Wyat, the transaction alluded to. Panegyrizing Mr. Samuel Lysons, for his work, on the remains of the *Roman villa*, at Woodchester, you add, " *which a friend* " *has just shewn me; a friend of mine was*

(e) 6 Ed. p. 341. The words, *as I was told*; and *my friend told me*; are printed in italics; in order, that the reader may more clearly understand, that this information, and ridicule, did not come from a member, who is under a solemn engagement to support, and honour the society.

(f) Ib. 284.

" much

“much entertained with the three tents:”(g)
 You threw in the *information of a friend*, in
 order to conceal your intimate connection
 with Mr. Samuel Lysons; and to give a
 higher varnish to your praise. In this spirit,
 and with the same design of anticipation,
 you mention Dr. Rennel, with studied praise;
 in your first edition, and with obvious neglect;
 in some subsequent editions:

“His learn'd *Apology* has Rennel fram'd,

“And may hereafter be with Barrow nam'd.”(h)

This couplet is followed by a long note,
 wherein you say, for the obvious purpose of
 concealing your well known intimacy with
 the Doctor; “I am obliged to a *Dignitary*
 “of the Church who sent me, as a present,

(g) Ib. p. 285.

(h) 4th Part, p. 84; the same verses and note are
 continued in the pretended third edition of your fourth
 part. In the 6th Ed. p. 350, and the 7th Ed. p. 410,
 Dr. Rennel is mentioned, carelessly, in the text, as having
 a *learned name*; and Dr. Barrow is quite excluded. In
 the 6th and 7th editions, the long note is suppressed;
 and instead thereof, Dr. Rennel is, merely, mentioned as
 [the] author of a very able, learned, and eloquent,
Apology for the Church of England.

“the

"the sermon to which I allude." You did not, then, receive *this present* from Dr. Ren-
nel himself, who was not backward in pre-
senting his *Apology*. It must, therefore, be
apparent to all, who know how much *your*
hopes and fears are to each other known, that
your subsequent alterations, both in the text,
and note, were made in concert with your
friend, who was, probably, frightened at
your panegyric:

"For Fame, impatient of extremes, decays,
"Not more by envy, than excess of praise."

You play off upon your readers other
modes of anticipation. You, who had min-
gled in the Chattertonian controversy, on the
wrong side, affect to know little about Chat-
terton, and Lord Orford's letter (1).

You
(i) Ib. 103. After treating very fully in your text,
of Rowley, and Chatterton, and Catcot, whom you offi-
cially praise, you add, in your note thereon; for
every couplet must have its note; "when I first pub-
lished the first part of this poem (1794) I had *casually*
"glanced at the subject of Rowley; but since, I have
"perused many of the learned treatises upon it. I nei-
"ther have, nor will have any thing to do with the deci-
"sion

You practise another trick of anticipation, whilst you, at the same time, recommend your own writings to the public notice. When you commend your *Runic Odes*, you again mention Mr. Mathias, as the author of the *Essay on Rowley and Chatterton* (k).

"tion of such a controversy;" and you subjoin in a *parenthesis* ("I speak from the *printed accounts*.") Now, the fact is, that your "*Essay on the evidence external and internal, relating to the Poems attributed to Thomas Rowley, &c.*" was published, in its second edition, during 1784; if indeed, a second edition there were, as the title page asserts. On this occasion, as we herein see, you practise a *double imposition*, for the obvious purpose of a still greater deception: you had, indeed, said, "I draw my humble information of Chatterton from his life in the *new Biographia Britannica*. They, *who have time*, may read Mr. Tyrwhit, Mr. Bryant, Dr. Milles, Mr. Thomas Warton, &c. but, I confine myself to the general view of this controversy in Mr. MATHIAS'S *candid and comprehensive Essay*." Add to these anticipations, your doubts, and hesitations, about Lord Orford's letters, on this well known subject. You now run out into an elaborate pangenyrick of half a dozen couplets on Catcot, the first patron of Chatterton.

(k) 6th Edit. p. 248-9.

You

You recommend your *Pair of Epistles* to the Rev. Dr. Randolph: "my mention of them, you, immediately, add, may possibly excite some curiosity (l)." Upon public principles, you recommend your *Political Dramatist* of the House of Commons, a satire (m).

But, as anticipation knows no bounds, you play off another artifice of deception, by pretending to be a Parliament-man: "To hear Mr. Fox, say you, as I perpetually do in the house (n)." Well: you do not say, that you are a member of Parliament; you only pretend, for the purpose of deception, that you are *perpetually*, in the House of Commons.

Yet, this practice of anticipation does not well accord with your pretended *retirement*. When you have panegyricized the *Baviad*, and the *Mæviad*, of Mr. [W] Gifford,

(l) 6th Edit. p. 283.

(m) 6th Edit. p. 112-14.

(n) 6th Edit. p. 213. The word *perpetually* you wrote in italicks, in order to mark more strongly your constant attendance in Parliament.

ford, you add, "I have not the honour of
 " his acquaintance; and indeed from the
 " *nature of my retirement*, I probably may
 " never see him (o)." You, who live in
 Scotland Yard; who run about the book-
 fellers' shops; who frequent the theatres;
 who attend the learned societies; who vi-
 sit the literary clubs; live in such *retire-*
ment, as, probably, never to see Mr. Wil-
 liam Gifford, who does not live altogether
 in retirement!

But, with all your retirement, you some-
 times wander through the Treasury Vaults;
 you even penetrate into the Treasury Cham-
 bers: But, you lament that *you never can*
see either Mr. Pitt, or the Lords of the Trea-
sury (p). And, although you thus solicit
 your

(o) Pur. of Lit. 6 Ed. p. 113.

(p) Ib. p. 35. "N. B. It often requires *miraculous*
 " *diligence*, even in these days, to get at one's ar-
 " rears. See Mr. Pitt and the Lords of the Treasury,
 " *if you can get a sight of them*. I never could." [*Ne-*
ver could, standing thus by itself, is ungrammatical.]
 The sense of this passage is marred, by the peculiarity
 of

your claims, without seeing Mr. Pitt, and the Lords of the Treasury, "you avow
" your poem to be the fruit and study of
" an independant and disinterested life,
" passed without the incumbrance of a pro-
" fession, or the embarrassment of busi-
" nefs (q)."

What an Oedipus ! You live, in the world, and out of the world ; you are dependent, and independent ; with a profession, and without a profession ; and you are a parliament-man, and not a parliament-man. Well ! Well ! Mathias ! Fact, which is the great illuminator of obscurities, will unriddle all those enigmatical *anticipations* : And, the fact is, that you are a Clerk in the Queen's Treasury, under Lord Aylesbury, as the Red-book shows. With such a list of anticipations before him, the reader is ready to cry out, with Marston :

" For shame ! unmask ; leave for to cloke intent ;

" And show, thou'rt vainglorious, impudent !"

of the pointing, which is perfectly consistent with similar peculiarities of punctuation, that may be traced through your whole writings.

(q) Pur. of Lit. 6 Ed. p. 111-12.

From

From such an accumulation of proofs, I will imitate Johnson, in appealing neither "to the boors of Middlesex, nor to the cits of London: For, of style, and sentiment, they take no cognizance:" But, I will strike a special jury of the boys of Westminster, and Eton, for the trial of the *issue*, whether you be guilty, or not guilty, of writing the *Pursuits of Literature*.

My Masters: This is a mere fact, which may be decided, by an investigation of circumstances, like other facts, of full as much importance, and of much more difficulty. The culprit has already published several lampoons, which are conceived, in a similar spirit; written, in the same strain of prosaic poetry, accompanied with similar notes, from his friend Stobæus; and given to the world, with the like purpose of vexing individuals, rather than of reforming vices^(r); the characteristic difference between

(r) For examples: The *Heroic Epistle* to the Rev. Dr. Watson, in 1780. There were published about that time, *Characters of Persons of eminence in Cambridge*,
who

tween satire and lampoon, consisting in this, that *satire* operates upon *vices*, but *lampoon* on *persons*.

My Masters : you will not be deluded, I trust, by the stories, he tells you, from *Scaliger*, and *Erasmus*, of the insufficiency of the comparison of style, and sentiment, for establishing the identity of the writer ; because *general* similarity, and *particular* analogy, lead to very different conclusions. In all the writings of Mathias, you see the same affectation of learned *mottos* ; yet, in all his tracts, you, also, see, the same want of acquaintance with his mother tongue ; whilst he pretends to know every other tongue, from the Greek, to the Hottentot ; yet, he every where displays the same ignorance of the idiom, and grammar, of the English language(s). In all his productions, you may

who were described by lines from Shakspeare. These lampoons were attributed to Mr. Mathias, when they appeared. Add to these, his *Pair of Epistles*, and his *Political Dramatist, &c. &c.*

(s) He appears, from his writings, not to know, that there is, in the English grammar, whatever LOWTH

may see striking specimens of his ridiculous unskilfulness in the operative part of composition; and of his being totally uninformed, with regard to the art of pointing, which is so essential, for the accuracy, and the clearness, of diction. I will submit to your consideration some remarkable examples: from

The VISIBLE *Mathias*: The INVISIBLE *Mathias*:

When comparing the In his note on the question about the existence of different doctrines of the several disputants, in his *Troy*, he says: "Some per-

may inculcate, such a form as the *subjunctive mood*. In his *Essay on Rowley*, p. 12, you may see: "But *if* the "present question deserves any investigation." See his *Pursuits*, 6 Ed. p. 72—"If he effects; p. 77, if he is appointed; *if* a copy *is*: And see p. 71, 75, 83, 107, 108, 160, 165, 224, &c. &c. &c. Mathias shows every where, that he does not understand the use of the English *article*. Ib. p. 53, 134, the Rev. Mr. Nares, [the] editor; 241, Dr. Gillies [the] author; and 366 (note *e*) a remarkable instance of his using *the* for *his*, &c. See his childish ignorance of English grammar, in his *Essay on Rowley*, p. 8: "the safety *and* well being "of mankind *is* [are] concerned;—the animosity *and* "heat of any contest *is* [are] not always. There *is* "[are] insanity of sound, *and* shallowness of argu- "ment (.) ;" in his *Shade of Pope*, p. 5.

Essay

Essay on Rowley, he recites thus: "That, these poems exhibit such a perfection, &c. (.) That our old English poets are minute, &c. (.) That, even in the narrative, the writer of these poems adopts ideal terms. (.) That his propensity to personification, is indulged, &c. (.) They are of opinion, That (.) That (.) That (.) That (.)" [See p. 64, 65, 66 to 82, for a thousand repetitions of the same improprieties, which show, clearly, that the writer is not aware of his own blunders.] And, in p. 112-13, he extends the impropriety of pointing, from the close of a sentence, to the beginning of a paragraph:--- "where he died unfortunately three months after (.)"

"That he was not ignorant of the French, Saxon and Latin tongues. (.)"

"That, &c. &c. [All

"sons have even declared that Mr. Bryant had no right to touch the subject (.) That nothing can be more contrary to reason than to suppose that the existence of a city, and a war, of which we have read with delight from our boyish days, should be called in question (.) That their pleasure is snatched from them: and such a poem, without any historical fact for a basis, cannot be interesting." [Purs. of Lit. 6 Ed. p. 236.] To these illustrative extracts, add from the Prefatory Epistle to his "Translation of passages from [the] Greek, Latin, Italian, and French writers, &c." the following passage in p. lxx: "The paraphrase and the meaning of them in a very extended sense, is [are] this [these]"

"(.) The time is now arrived; &c." This passage

those, who are acquainted with English grammar, must perceive, that as there is nothing fully affirmed, or denied, in these independent paragraphs, they must be defective, both in grammar, and in sense.]

sage, which is a singular example of every possible fault, in writing, connects, with *hooks of Steel*, the *translator*, with the *author*, and the *invisible*, with the *visible*, Mathias, who was not aware, that his profound ignorance would thus furnish decisive proofs of the sameness of the writer; and, consequently, a clear detection of this mighty secret.

I have now submitted to your judgements, a very remarkable *peculiarity* of *punctuation*, in the pages of the visible, and the invisible, Mathias: There is no printer, who, without the direction of the Author, would thus insert so many *full points*, *before* the *closure* of *the sense*. And, by this improper mode of pointing, every sentiment is rendered ungrammatical, and the connection of reasoning intended is totally destroyed: For, as the sense closes with the point (.) there can be no grammatical reference to what goes before: This, then, is a strong proof,

proof, that *the Essay on Rowley*, and *the Pursuits of Literature*, were written by the same Author.—Now ; in weighing probabilities, for the purpose of *probation*, the chances are a hundred to one, that two different writers would not adopt the same *affected*, ungrammatical, and absurd, punctuation(*t*), which, by this disjunction of the sentences, leaves nothing, in them, predicated of any proposition.

My Masters : This, therefore, is a distinct consideration, from that, which a comparison of style affords, for the ascertaining

(*t*) See also the 6 Ed. p. 309 [Note O] “ My allusion in the verse is this(.) [:] After the profanation of “ the temple, &c.” In this note, we see, as we may also see, in many other passages throughout this work, the same peculiarity of pointing, the same false grammar, the same absurd reasoning. Speaking of the Bishop of Lincoln, he says, “ he was Tutor and Secretary to “ the Right Hon. William Pitt, before he was raised to “ the Prelacy(.) A man of learning and of ability(.)” [Pur. Lit. 6 Edit. 162.] This last sentence, standing thus substantively by itself, in consequence of the full stop(.) after *Prelacy*, predicates nothing of any person : And, therefore, the intended compliment to a learned person is marred by appropriate unskillfulness.

of the identity of the Author. The same observation is equally applicable, when we see this writer, taking the very expressions from one of his own books, to insert them in another; outfacing his own objections to Dr. Warton: In *his Political Dramatist*, speaking of the House of Commons, he says, "the House was up:" And, in *his Pursuits of Literature*, speaking of the same subject, he adopts the same words, "the House is up (x)." Not only the same expressions are adopted from one work, and placed in another, of the same writer, but the same topics are assumed, and re-assumed by him; constantly mistaking lampoon, for satire; and, throughout his writings he is only consistent, in being uniformly inconsistent; his constant practice standing, perpetually, opposed to his avowed principle.

How say you, Masters, is Mathias guilty, or not guilty, of writing *The Pursuits of Li-*

(x) "If from *State farces*, when *the House is up*" [6 Ed. p. 111.] So, *confine*, for confinement, is used in his *Runic Odes*, p. 10, and also in his *Pursuits*, in the same sense. [7 Ed. 300.]

terature? Guilty. You say, Guilty; and so, you say all? Yes(y).

With

(y) In addition to those already advanced, I submit to the reader the following facts, and considerations, which were communicated to me by a friend; and which, having been collected for his own satisfaction, with regard to the *real Author of the Pursuits of Literature*, may perhaps satisfy others; who may be struck, by a new arrangement, and convinced, by dissimilar proofs:—

1. It is remarkable, that the person, to whom that work was first attributed was the same person, on whom the public judgement has ultimately settled: For, Mr. Mathias had addressed a letter to the Marquis of Buckingham on the subject of the *emigrant French Priests*. [It was printed in October 1796.] The same uncharitableness animated Mr. Mathias's conversation, and the same virulence, on the score of religion, debased the pages of *The Pursuits of Literature*, as had been already served up, in the epistle to the noble Marquis, whose name was used, because he is eminent.

2. The suspicions, which arose from those coincidences of spirit, and language, were strengthened in the mind of all those, who heard Mr. Mathias, in book-sellers shops, daily clearing the obscurities, and readily pointing the wit of his own *Pursuits*; particularly, the obscurity, and the wit, of repeating *Barrister Erskine*; none of the literati, who frequent Payne's shop, at the

With all this weight of circumstantial evidence on the affirmative side of this question,

Mews gate, understanding the purpose, or the wit, of repeating the professional name of a professional man.

3. Although Mr. Mathias denied, that he was the Author; yet, he seemed always happy, when the writer was praised, as the Author of a poem, so satirical, and of notes, so erudite.

4. Notwithstanding those prudish denials, the original opinion of the public became fixed on Mr. Mathias, when it was clearly seen, that any literary mistake in *the Pursuits*, which was mentioned to him, was sure to be corrected in the next edition; when it was observed, that the Author was ready to alter characters, in which Mr. Mathias was shown to have been mistaken; that his praise was usually scattered on those, who shared his esteem, whilst his censure was bestowed on those, who, having noted his defects, had scarcely regarded his merits.

5. Mr. Mathias was heard, at the table of the Chaplains, at St. James's, to praise the Bishop of Norwich, in appropriate terms, which were the more noted, as the praise was just; and the same praises, in the same words, were afterwards observed in the fourth part of *The Pursuits of Literature*.

6. When Mr. Mathias was at the same table, on a different day, complaining, there, as he complained sometimes, at other places, of being deemed the Author
of

tion, there is not the least proof, that any other person wrote this book, or were capable

of *The Pursuits of Literature*, Mr. Bryant asked him, why he did not imitate the example of Doctor Rennel, if he equally wished not to be thought the real Author: But, he neither adopted this advice, nor, expressly, affirmed, that he was not the Author.

7. When a person, who left his name with the printer, advertised Mr. Mathias, week after week, in the news-papers, as the real Author of *The Pursuits of Literature*, he remained silent, at least he made no public denial; neither confessing, nor denying, the imputation; being plainly conscious of guilt, and knowing, that his guilt could be proved.

8. When Mr. Boscawen was translating Horace, he told one of the Commissioners, who sat at the same Board with himself, that he some times translated a verse, as he rode to town; the same Commissioner mentioned this anecdote to Mr. Mathias; who is said to have been the only person acquainted with it: And, in the next Edition of *The Pursuits*, that natural circumstance, of translating on horseback, was made a topick of triumphant ridicule.

9. Those several probabilities are carried up to moral certainty by the *virtual* admission of Mr. Mathias himself: For, when Mr. Drummond published his translation of *Persius*, he sent a copy of it, not to Mr. Mathias, but to "the Author of *the Pursuits of Literature*:"

pable of writing, a lampoon so inconsistent in principles, and so malignant in design: Now; all the great masters of logick agree in one judgement, that, if we find many circumstances on one side, and none on the other, the constitution of our minds requires, that we should yield assent to that side, which has some evidence, rather than to that, which has none: "The only reasonable inquiry is," says Hammond, "which is of *probables* the most, or of *improbables*, the least such."

ture:" And, when Mr. Drummond soon after met Mr. Mathias, he thanked the translator, for his present; as I have been assured. Add to this anecdote, another fact: A certain noble Lord received from the bookseller a copy of *The Pursuits of Literature*, with these accompanying words, "From the Author:" Some time after, the noble Lord met Mr. Mathias, in the street, who said to him, "I hope your Lordship received the book, I sent you:" "You mean *The Pursuits of Literature*," said his Lordship, "I thank you for it." Now; circumstantial proof is generally considered by judges, as the most satisfactory; because various circumstances, all converging to the same point, lead more decisively to truth, than the evidence of a witness, who is liable to error.

In

In proportion as you were traced through all the doublings of your subterfuges; in proportion as the public opinion, gradually, settled upon you, as the author; you redoubled your activity to conceal your guilt, by your blandishments; to conciliate individuals, by presenting your pamphlets; and to form a faction, by your intrigues, who might favour your retreat from a dangerous position: And whilst you strengthened these motives by habit, and confirmed them by principle, you listened, with willing ears, to the counsels of Brutus; who, like you, was an honourable man:

“ ——— Seek no hiding place, *conspiracy!*”

“ Hide it in smiles and affability:”

When I have seen you thus following that honourable counsel, at the public meetings of literary men, “ *making practised smiles;*” and shaking the hands of those, whom you had, lately, lampooned, I was ready to exclaim, with *my* OCTAVIUS:

“ And some that smile, have in their hearts,

“ I fear, millions of mischief.”

Such are the proofs of your being the Author of the Pursuits of Literature, which
I submit

I submit to all those, who understand the nature of evidence, and delight in the investigations of truth : They will easily perceive, that special circumstances can never be answered by general declamations. When we consider the testimony of the first publisher, the declarations of two other booksellers : the evidence of your private letters, and of your avowals to women ; your significant anticipations, and striking peculiarities of pointing ; your talk, and your intrigues ; those facts, and circumstances, must be deemed equivalent to *moral certainty*, by every person, who has not a favorite to protect, or a falsehood to propagate (z).

2. I may

(z) Since I finished the foregoing argument, I have been furnished with a strong proof of my conclusion, in the text, by the perusal of the *HEROIC EPISTLE*, "with elaborate notes, and very learned references," which was addressed to the Rev. Dr. Watson, the Regius Professor of Divinity, in Cambridge ; and which has been attributed to T. J. Mathias. [It was printed for Becket, 1780, in quarto, p. p. 28.] An accurate examination of this *Heroic Epistle* has convinced me, that it was written by the author of the *PURSUITS OF LITERATURE*.

There

2. I may now assume it as a certainty, what is clearly proved, that you are the Author

There are, in both, the same malignity of purpose, and affectation in the mode of pursuing it; the same lust of acquiring distinction, by the same unworthy means. And, in both, there are the same specimens of uncouth verification: For instance, in the *Epistle*, p. 21.

"While from his lips in theologic fume

Verbocinations Latial despume."

In this opacity, there cannot be discerned a glimmering of Sense: Again, in p. 22.

"But why should you be deeply cogitating

"Our states naufrageous and periclitating?"

Such unmeaning nonsense, and such peculiar barbarism, can only be paralleled in *the Pursuits*: In both may be seen the same illegitimate rhymes; In the *Epistle*: Chair, were; be, L. L. D; Air, Lanoaster; prest on, Rubicon. In the *Pursuits* too may be seen the same affectation, which Johnson censured in his *Life of Gray*, of giving to adjectives derived from substantives, the termination of participles: In the *Epistle* may be seen: *purpled youth, lilled Edward, cloister'd Glyn, willow'd academe, laggard age*. In these writings, we may every where trace the same barbarous use of strange, and unauthorized words: In the *Epistle*, p. 4, *Anchis'ean alacrity, courtier world*, p. 9, *grimy circle*, p. 17, *apronbellies*, p. 19, *Verbocinations Latial*, p. 21. *Naufrageous periclitating*, p. 22, *unlatin'd Englishmen*: Of the author of *the Epistle*, and of the *Pursuits*,

it

thor of the *Pursuits of Literature*; a book, which I will, in the second place, proceed to

it cannot be said, that he is either *unlatin'd*, or *ungreek'd*. But, it may be said, *Battus is come again*: For, he has, in the *Epistle*, p. 26, "*bold, intrepid, strides*:" In the *Pursuits*, 7th ed. p. 327, may be seen "*tir'd, and jaded*." The same writer repeats, in both, his peculiar phrases: In the *Epistle*, p. 28, *my dear Doctor*: In the *Pursuits*, *my dear Adam*: In the *Epistle* p. 24, there is the unlucky barbarism, *Academe*; In the *Pursuits* 7 ed. p. 229, there also is the same barbarism *Academe*. In the *Epistle*, p. 24, "*cloister'd Glynn, wrapt up in Rowley and his red Surtout*," is celebrated as the *dilectus IAPIS*: In the *Pursuits*, 7 ed. p. 419-21, there is the same peculiar talk of "*her lov'd Iapis on the banks of Cam*," with an express reference, in the note, to "*her dilectus IAPIS, Robert GLYNN*:" This last coincidence, then, brings this investigation to a *moral certainty*, that the same head, and hand, conceived, and wrote, in this manner, of "*the lov'd IAPIS on the banks of Cam*:" For, in weighing probabilities, the chances are a thousand to one, that two authors would not write, in this style, and sentiment, of such a person; who, as he was *wrapt up in Rowley*, was peculiarly dear to T. J. Mathias, the *Essayist on Rowley*. In the *Epistle* too, as in the *Pursuits*, may be seen the same seditious sarcasms on *Britain's King*, the same congenial celebrations of *Junius*, *Macgregor*, and the other scribblers, who, twenty years ago, drew after them

to examine, freely, but briefly: exhibiting the whole under distinct views; and following up each position, by indubitable evidence.

PROOFS of *your* IMPERTINENCE.

I produce, at once, the ADVERTISEMENT to your 7th edition; which was dated, the 30th of March, 1798. "The following, "or similar words," say you, "are recorded "to have been once delivered in Parliament

them the *mob of gentlemen who write with ease, as monsters make a show*. But, the Rev. Dr. Watson is praised in the *Pursuits*, and censured in the *Epistle*: So are Mr. Sheridan, and Mr. Steevens. By what *chymical process* these singular changes were performed, I pretend not to know. Yet, I see, distinctly, what I maintain to be a strong proof of my general position, that the same tergiversation of principle, and practice, prevails throughout the whole satyrical writings of T. J. Mathias: He praises, in one page, the persons whom he dispraises, in the next: And when he has carried his lampoon into libel, he often retracts what he had said, in some preceding paragraph, or pamphlet, by adding some qualifying passage, or by some other trick of tergiversation, which is peculiar to himself, and which he arrogates, forsooth, as a merit.

"a few

“ a few years before the rebellion in 1745.
 [The true date is the 10th of March,
 1740-1.] “ The words are these.[:] The
 “ heat which has offended them is the
 “ ardour of conviction, and that zeal for
 “ the service of my country, which neither
 “ hope nor fear shall influence me to sup-
 “ press. I will not sit unconcerned, when
 “ PUBLIC liberty is threatened or invaded,
 “ nor look in silence upon (intended) PUB-
 “ LIC ROBBERY. I will exert my endea-
 “ vours, at whatever hazard, to drag the
 “ aggressors to justice, whoever may pro-
 “ tect them, AND WHOEVER may (ulti-
 “ mately) PARTAKE of the NATIONAL
 “ PLUNDER.” “ It is,” you add, “ re-
 “ markable: the speaker was WILLIAM
 “ PITT; the Reporter, SAMUEL JOHN-
 “ SON.[:] No more:” And, you quote,
 for your authority, Dr. Johnson’s Parlia-
 mentary Debates (a). What falsehood!

What

(a) ‘ I do not hesitate to avow, that I was the person,
 ‘ who recommended to the bookseller the publication of
 ‘ Johnson’s *Debates*, for the benefit of the liberal youth of
 our

What imposition! What affectation! Such is your veracity, that though the book, which you quote, informed you, expressly, that Mr. Pitt never delivered that speech, you would, contrary to the declaration of Dr. Johnson, impose on the world, a fiction, for a fact. And you, studiously, substitute an indefinite time, for the real day, when the speech is supposed to have been spoken; because *fraud* delights to deal in *generals*. That illustrious statesman pronounced so many fine speeches, and did so many great actions, that he, who attributes to him speeches, which he never spoke, or actions, which he never performed, only dishonours him. Yet, you do this, although the au-

our island. I contributed the *Preface*, which "acknowledged, that Johnson did not give so much what the "Speakers, respectively, said, as what each ought to "have said." Johnson was assiduous to declare those "speeches to be fictitious; and, particularly, a short "time before his death, he expressed his regret, for his "having been the Author of fictions, which passed for "realities." [Bosw. Life, vol. i. p. 129]. With the mere operative part of the publication of Johnson's *Debates*, I had no concern.

M m

thor

thor of the speech informed you, that it was certainly fictitious. By thus substituting fiction, for truth, you departed, equally, from the lessons of Johnson, the moralist, and Dryden, the poet, which last advises, in portraying such a character, to—

“ ———— Draw him strictly so,

“ That all who view the piece may know,

“ He needs no trappings of fictitious fame.”

You are determined, it seems, to watch over *public liberty*, which is either invaded, or threatened; to drag to justice the aggressors, who partake in the *public plunder*, whoever may protect them. Well: But, in what character are you to act? Are you a Member of Parliament? Are you an eminent Member of Parliament, as Mr. Pitt undoubtedly was, in 1741? No: Yet, you assure us, on another occasion, that “ though
“ without authority, and in a very private
“ station, I will consider myself in some
“ measure, as sent forth in the public service (b).” And, you might have added,

(b) The Prefat. Epist. to your Transl. lxvi.

in

in the same tone of importance, the Representatives of the people in Parliament, being themselves unequal to the task of protecting liberty, and guarding property. OURSELF alone are equal to the mighty charge! And, you are, of course, welcomed, on earth, by honest NOODLE, in the excellent Life of TOM THUMB, *the great*

Needle.—"Sure he was sent express,
 "From Heav'n to be the pillar of our State.
 "Though small his body be, so very small,
 "A Chairman's leg is more than twice as large,
 "Yet is his soul, like any mountain big,
 "And as a mountain once brought forth a mouse,
 "So doth this mouse contain a mighty mountain."

You oppose your advertisement "to the
 "enemies of the principles of your work,
 "but not to the enemies of the work itself."
 I avow myself the determined enemy, not,
 indeed, of the work itself, which I despise
 for its nonsense, and detest, for its jacobin-
 ism; but, to *the principles* of your work,
 which no honest man can approve. I am
 the enemy of *the principles* of your work;
 because you attempt to separate the govern-
 ment from the constitution, and the governed

from the governors; because you endeavour to confound all persons, and all parties; because attacking, personally, both the living and the dead, you convert your satire into lampoon; because you celebrate republicans, and dispraise loyalists; particularly, those loyalists, who, during the present times, have ably, and successfully, defended the constitution, and supported the government, at some risque, and at some expence: I am the more an enemy of this practice, and of that principle of your work; because, I see your object, and note your selfishness: Those writers, you say, in the persuasive language of your *practice*, whatever may be their power and their success, are but poultry scribblers;

“Hirelings of State, or Opposition slaves;”(c)

When compared with OURSELF, and OUR PURSUITS.. Well: I will allow you to be a great writer, if you will only learn to write English with common propriety; and admit you to be an able constitutionalist, if you

(c) Pursuits, 6 Edit. p. 190.

will

will but acquire habits of constitutional consistency: I will, moreover, acknowledge, with the king, in *Tom Thumb*, that,

"Thy modesty's a candle to thy merit:

"It shines itself, and shews thy merit too."

Yet, who are those invaders of liberty, I wonder, and plunderers of the people, whom, you pledge yourself to drag to justice? In the language of opposition, and in the intrigue of jacobinism, the King's ministers are the persons, who are, constantly, held up, as the foes of freedom, and the plunderers of property: And, in your advertisement, we thus see confusion worse confounded. The Queen's servant is to drag to justice the King's ministers, whoever may protect them! In all your lampoons, you are, continually, tilting at Mr. Pitt: And, in your last publication, when you, professedly, come forth to *ridicule* Mr. Grattan, you attempt, with your usual consistency of principle, to *criminate* Mr. Pitt (*d*). A clerk in the Queen's Treasury

(*d*) "The want of œconomy (*I know what I advance*)
"is the *chief* and prominent defect of Mr. Pitt's ad-

Treasury assumes the controul of the King's Chancellor of the Exchequer! You, thus, with a jacobin spirit, introduce the anarchy, which Shakspeare has finely dramatised, by showing, "Liberty pluck Justice by the nose; the baby beat the nurse." What a baby; to beat such a nurse!

But, you are the baby, who, in the assumed character of a satirist, beats many a nurse. When you put on the garb of satire, you only clothe yourself in an invidious habit: And, when you pervert the meaning of the word, and the purpose of the thing, by "converting *satire* into *lampoon*," you merely throw off the invidiousness of the former, to put on the maliciousness of the latter. Yet, you suppose, that there is something noble, in

"ministration." [The shade of Alexander Pope, &c: p. 38.] I quote this passage, at present, for the purpose of proving my assertion in the text: I will, hereafter, animadvert on its inconsistency, and falsehood. Mean time, the following passage [Pursuits, 7th Ed. p. 131] may fairly be deemed an useful Commentary: "Modern State œconomy seems to consist in spending or squandering the greatest possible sums in the least possible time."

the

the spirit, and something dignified, in the practice, of satire. Buoyed up by this conceit, you defy "grim-fac'd reproof." And, in several prefaces, you employ all the artifices of sophistry, and all the inanity of such arguments, to defend your writings, and to explain their purpose; without making one defence of what cannot be defended, and without explaining, what indeed by any other pen might be easily explained. Such, however, is the spirit of your artifice, that you think it clothes you in the *blanket of the night*, which enables you to say to yourself, that—

"———Cloud, and ever-during dark

"Surrounds me!"

The question is not, what was the practice of lampoon at Athens, or the conduct of satire at Rome: But, what is the proper meaning, and the accustomed allowance, of both, in Britain; as the words are found in our language, and as both are tolerated by our manners, and sanctioned by our laws: "SATIRE," saith Johnson(*e*), "is a poem,

(*e*) Dictionary.

“ in which wickedness, or folly, is censured.
 “ Proper Satire is distinguished, by the ge-
 “ nerality of the reflection, from a lampoon,
 “ which is aimed against a *particular person*;
 “ but *they are too frequently confounded.*”

And, Roscommon instructs the satirist:

“ You must not think, that a satirick style

“ Allows of scandalous and brutish words.”

“ LAMPOON,” saith Johnson, “ is a *per-*
 “ *sonal* satire; is *censure*, written not to re-
 “ form, but to vex.” The whole lexico-
 graphy of our language; the practice of our
 earliest, and best, satirists; the amenity of
 our manners; the voice of our laws; all re-
 cognize Johnson’s principle to be right, and
 his definitions to be just. If we may judge
 of the tree by its fruit, you differ, widely,
 from the great moralist, on this point (*f*):

Your

(*f*) Pursuits, 7 Ed. p. [8.] “ A moralist and a divine
 “ have not the same office with a *satirist*; *personality* is
 “ foreign to them.” [Ib. p. 10.] We hereby see, that
 your precept corresponds with your practice: On the
 contrary, I maintain, that *personality* is *foreign* to the duty
 of a *satirist*: The lampooner only deals in *personality*.
 Yet, you insist that, “ Satire never can have effect,

“ without

Your practice is, to *lampoon* in your text, by specifications of Names; and to enlarge upon your text, in your notes, by "*censure*" "plainly written, not to reform, but to "vex." No one objects to the legitimate practice of proper satire, which is distinguished by the *generality* of its censures. And, when you repeatedly answer objections, which were never made, you only place yourself in the ridiculous position of the jack pudding, who fights a fleeting shadow with his wooden lath. The true objections to your poems are, that you, continually, confound satire with lampoon; and are ever writing lampoon, for satire. You are subtle enough to see the true objection; but your sophistry is sufficiently alert to evade the real question. The repetition of your answers, which are always impertinent, has enrolled you in the honourable list of AN-

"without a *personal* application. It must come home to "the bosoms, and often to the offences of particular "men." [Ib. p. 9.] This doctrine, I maintain, is illegal, and libellous, irreligious and immoral.

SWER

SWER-JOBBER, whom Swift has denounced for having no conscience.

But, it is a hard task to answer strong objections, which do not admit of pertinent answers. Dryden, who was a satirist, although not equal, to be sure, to you, saw the difficulty; but he could only avoid it, by acting differently from you: He admitted, honestly, what every honest man must admit, that *lampoon*, or *personal* satire, cannot be justified. "In a word," says DRYDEN (g), "that former sort of satire, which is known in England, by the name of LAMPOON, is a dangerous sort of weapon, and for the most part *unlawful*. We HAVE NO MORAL RIGHT ON THE REPUTATION OF OTHER MEN. 'Tis *taking from them what we cannot restore to them*. There are only two reasons, for which we may be permitted to write *lampoons*; and I will not promise, that they can al-

(g) I quote from Dryden's Dedication of his Translation of Juvenal's Satires to the Earl of Dorset. Ed. 1702, p. 58-9; being "a Discourse concerning the original and progress of Satire."

“ ways justify us. The first is revenge,
 “ when we have been affronted in the same
 “ nature, or have been any ways notoriously
 “ abused, and can make ourselves no other
 “ reparation. The second reason, which
 “ may justify a poet, when he writes against
 “ *a particular person*; and that is, when he
 “ is become a public nuisance.” Now; I
 demand what *moral right* have you on the
reputation of other men. Your answer must
 be, with Dryden, whom you quote as an
 authority, in point (*b*), that you have no mo-
 ral right over any man’s reputation: And
 this fair answer shows the arrogance of your
 constant practice, which is as inconsistent
 with our manners, as contrary to our laws.
 Warburton appears to have concurred with
 Dryden; when *he set up*, as the best defence
 for the *Dunciad*, that the various dunces had
first attacked Pope. But, who, I wonder, at-
 tacked you, before you came forth with your
 lampoons? The real offence, which you

(*h*) Pursuits, 7 Ed. p. 8: As you rely on the authority of Dryden, you ought to be concluded by it.

felt,

felt, was subsequent; and consisted, in not taking any notice either of you, or of your writings (i). Well: I will allow, that to

(i) There was one person, however, a poet, and a scholar, who, I am told, provoked lampoon by a different conduct. On perusing the first part of the *Pursuits of Literature*, Mr. Pye expressed his approbation of it to Mr. Owen, the original bookseller, in rather strong terms; that on the next day, Mr. Owen sent him, from the Author, the first part of the *Pursuits*, and the *Epistle from the Emperor of China*; that the next time he went into Mr. Owen's shop, he gave Mr. Pye a letter, written in a very odd hand, but not purporting to be from the Author; stating, that the letter writer was pleased to hear Mr. Pye had spoken highly of the Poem, and that he should do well to continue to do so, as the Author was a person of eminence, both in the literary, and political world; that Mr. Pye was, thereupon, so struck with the insolence of this demand, that he said, with some warmth, He never would say one word more in favour of it to any body: In the second part, appeared, accordingly, *Spartan Pye*, and the soporific Lectures of Tyrtæus, at Coxheath, and Warley. I have several of Mr. Mathias's threatening letters to literary men, written in the same odd, elongated, hand. I understand he is in the frequent practice of writing, in the same hand, his flatteries, in his presentation copies.

neglect

neglect the mighty Mathias was a great offence:

“ ——— *Pride* hath no other glass

“ To shew itself, but *pride*; for supple knees

“ Feed arrogance, and are the proud man’s fees.”

But, *the dead* can neither give, nor take, offence. Have they also neglected you? Have they raised “ a warning voice” against the principles of your Pursuits? You can raise “ the shade of Pope:” But, can you lay the ghosts of Bishop Wilkins; of Bishop Newton; of Dr. Adam Smith; of M. Court de Gebelin; whose graves you have opened, and whose fame you have wronged?

You attack “ the wild rapture and empiric “ rage” of Cestria’s mitred lord, at the opening of your second dialogue (*k*). Wilkins was an honour to England, says Burnet, who was not very lavish of his praise: Wilkins was one of the fathers of the Royal Society (*l*): And, these are, no doubt, sub-

(*k*) 6th Ed. p. 67.

(*l*) “ Upon my word,” say you, “ *Philosophy* is a very “ pleasant thing: It makes us laugh sometimes.” The astronomical discoveries of HERSCHELL are ridiculed in the same note. [Ib. p. 68.]

stantial

stantial reasons, for dragging a bishop from his grave, merely to furnish topicks of lampoon. You had been poaching in the *Scribleriad* of Owen Cambridge, where you saw the *wild rapture* of Bishop Wilkins, repeatedly, mentioned (*m*). In the *Scribleriad*, I had seen this subject treated, without any emotion of disgust: But, Cambridge has playfulness, without malignity: Mathias has malignity, without playfulness.

But, why drag Bishop Newton from his quiet grave (*n*)? He was not the Bishop of

(*m*) *Scrib.* 1751, p. 26-7. You have killed many a partridge in the *Scribleriad*. You have appropriated, as your own, without the consent of the Lord of the Manor, sentiments, and expressions. Your character of *Morosoph-os* is only the *Morosoph* of Cambridge. [*Ib.* 30, bk. 5, p. 5.

O! for that *warning voice* which Cadmus heard

[*Scrib.* 29.]

Some *warning voice* invites to yonder ground.

[Shade of Pope, p. 1.]

(*n*) *Pursuits*, 7 Ed. p. 332; 333. Note (*g*); 334. Note (*qq*): In these *learned*, and *witty*, notes, there are several blunders: *Aculeated* for *aculeate*: *Neither* is followed by *or*, instead of *nor*.

St.

St. Pol. He would have emigrated, I doubt not, rather than have relinquished his faith: and he would have followed the example of the *seven bishops*, rather than have sacrificed his principle: But, his blameless life, and his writings in support of Christianity, could not shield him, from the lampoon of your charity:

"Peace, Peace, for shame, if not for Charity!"

"Urge neither *shame*, nor *charity* to me," say you: "For resolved I am, to satirize
"Doctor Adam Smith, who taught finance
"to a most spendthrift minister (a):

"Prove that no dogs, as through the streets they range,
"Give bone for bone in regular exchange.

"My dear Adam," you add, in your note, "this philosophy of yours is nearly of
"the same date as your ancestors in Eden,
"and I can only say, in reply, *Who ever ex-*

(a) "Adam Smith, the great writer on Wealth and Finance; from whom Mr. Pitt learned his art."
[Pur. Lit. 6 Ed. p. 87.] No: Dr. Smith did not write on Wealth and Finance; but, on *the* Wealth of Nations.

"*packed*

“ *pected to see a dog do so?*” (p) In return, let me ask a question, which is full as pertinent, did *dear Adam* expect to see such a fight? But, I will defend a dead philosopher from lampoon, by the authority of an immortal poet:

“ Will any dog that hath his teeth and stones,
 “ Resign’dly leave his bitches and his bones,
 “ To turn a wheel, and bark to be employ’d,
 “ While Venus is by other dogs enjoy’d? (q)”

But, this remarkable coincidence between the questions of the philosopher, and the poet, does not mollify your spirit of lampoon: Nay; my dear Dryden, you repeat, who ever, but the æconomical doctor, *expected to see a dog do so?*

This question, however, admits of an easy solution, when compared with the inquiry,
 “ What must we say to M. Court de Ge-
 “ belin, who has actually endeavoured to
 “ *reason us into a belief* that the founders
 “ of the Roman state, Romulus, and Re-
 “ mus, were only allegorical personages.”

(p) Pursuits, 4th Part, p. 70-3.

(q) Dryden’s Essay on Satire.

Mr. Court de Gebelin (*r*), with all the ingenuity, and learning, which he has displayed in nine quarto volumes, on the *Monde Primatif*, will never be forgiven, for drawing, by anticipation, your character: "Critiques superbes & exclusifs presque tous jours ignorans:" And so, Monf. *Critique superbe, & exclusif*, I leave you (if I may scribble in your style) to trace the tale of Romulus, and Remus, in the fictions of history, or to find them, as real persons, in the allegories of fable.

With these recent instances before us, of *the universality* of the satire, in your writings, which comprehends both the living, and the dead, we may say, with *Pisanio*:

"——— Kings,

(*r*) He was a *Protestant*, which circumstance does not conciliate your charity; and he *died*, in 1785, which event does not exempt him from your hypercriticism! When you wish to be witty, you would do well to avoid the appearance of blunder: "Remus, it seems, say you, signified **THE SUN** in the Winter, and Romulus, in *the Summer*. [7 Ed. Pur. p. 283.] You meant to say: And Romulus signified *the Sun*, in the Summer.

" ———Kings,(s) Queens,(t) and States,(u)

" Maids,(x) Matrons;(y) nay, *the secrets of the grave*;(z)

" This viperous slander enters.

This,

(s) Considering your own official situation, and the circumstances of *the times*, you use too many freedoms, with great *Augustus*; particularly, in your *Chinese Epistle*; in what you say of Poet Mason; and in recommending JUNIUS, an adjudged libel, as *a classical book*.

(t) You satirize Sir J. B. Burgeſs's Poem, on the Princess Elizabeth's Drawings; which poem appears to be dedicated to the Queen, by her royal permission: Considering your station, what is this but the scullion in the kitchen, who lampoons the dignified Mistress of a vast domain.

(u) Both Houses of Parliament are libelled throughout the *Pursuits of Literature*.

(x) A *Duke's chaste Daughter* is lampooned. [6 Ed. p. 105.]

(y) Mrs. Montague is lampooned for her able and elegant Vindication of Shakspeare against the impertinences of Voltaire.—The Marchioness of Buckingham is lampooned as "the great PATRONESS OF THE CATHOLIC CAUSE in England." [Pair of Epistles, p. 28.]

(z) I have just shown two Prelates of the Church of England dragged from their graves; and those two very able writers, in their several departments of literature, Dr. Adam Smith, and Mr. Court de Gebelin, ridiculed in

This *universality* of your satire, you carry even into the professions of men: In your *Pair of Epistles*, you lampoon several eminent physicians, lawyers, and divines: You lampoon the professors, and fellows, of colleges; you libel the learned societies, their presidents, and their secretaries; you lampoon all parties, and persons, in the state; you lampoon respectable characters, for their mere manner; their habits of speaking, or modes of walking; although every one has a right, surely, to his own amusements, and his character. You also lampoon *personal defects*:

“ From the *spare* Rumford to the *pallid* Knight.”

What is this, but to introduce into the literary world, and into our domestic retirements, the same sort of monster, who, some years ago, ran about the town, wounding,

in death. The amiable, and learned Tyrwhit is lampooned: The late Doctor Stukely, to whom the Archæological world owe so much, is sacrificed at the shrine of Mr. Samuel Lysons: [Shade of Pope, p. 68.]

“ The Dennes, and owlish *Stukeleys* of the day,

“ Retire abash'd at Lyson's rising day.”

N n 2

savagely,

savagely, unprotected women. The necessity of self-defence demands, that the learned societies, the literary meetings, professional men, official men, matrons, maids;—all, should be warned against this monster of a lampooner: Have a care, then, good people; see Mathias comes!

“Frontless, and Satire proof, he scours the streets;

“And runs a *Malayan Muck* at all he meets.”

Even Pope, who carried his satire to the very verge of scurrility, declares that, “To
“a true *satirist*, nothing is so odious as a
“*libeller*, for the same reason, as to a man
“truly *virtuous*, nothing is so hateful as a
“hypocrite (*a*).” What! are we a libeller? “Is there I *ask*, with *confidence*, in
“OUR PURSUITS, any sentence or any sentiment, by which the mind may be de-
“praved, degraded *and* [or] corrupted
“ed (*b*)?” Yes: I am one of those *ignorant men*, who maintain, that your *Pursuits of Literature* are a continued libel, which has a necessary tendency to deprave, de-

(*a*) Warton's Edition of Pope, vol. iv. p. 59.

(*b*) Pur. 7 Ed. p. 10.

grade, and corrupt; and, which by its personal scandal, “panders [panders] to the vitiated taste of the present times:” Your satirical verse, with its libellous prose, is a continual lampoon, a species of writing, which is neither legal, nor moral. Your confidence, however, is not to be confounded, though it may be chastised. “They,” you add, “who would consider my reprehensions of authors and of the tendency of their writings, as libels or as libellous matter, are as ignorant of common law, as they are forgetful of common sense, or common integrity and candour(c).” And, you might have added, in the same tone of arrogance, “I AM *Sir* ORACLE; and, when I ope my lips, let no dog bark.”

You join issue, then, with the *ignorant men*, your opponents, on the libellousness of your *Pursuits* of Literature. You call upon them to produce their authorities; to contradict Blackstone, the great sage of the law, if they dare; and you challenge them

(c) *Ib.* p. 11.

to show, "that any part of your book is
 "blasphemous, immoral, treasonable, schif-
 "matical, seditious, or scandalous (d)." And, considering your context, you might have safely added,

"I am to pray you not to strain my speech

"To grosser issues, nor to larger reach,

"Than to suspicion."

I will not strain your speech to larger reach. I will say, however, that Dryden had warned you of the *unlawfulness* of lampoon; of your having no moral right over any man's reputation; I will add, that Johnson had taught you the difference between lampoon and satire; the one being general against vices, the other, particular against persons: And, you might have easily inferred from those authorities, if your own conceit had not led you astray, that you might satirize wickedness, without charging John Styles with being wicked; that you might satirize vice, without accusing Thomas Nokes with being vicious; and that you might satirize swindling, without

(d) Pursuits, 7 Ed. p. 11.

charging *Foulis*, with being a swindler : Yet, you, deliberately, differ with Dryden, and Johnson, in your judgement of the legitimate province of satire ; saying, expressly, “ that satire never can have effect, “ without a *personal application* : It must “ come to *the bosoms*, and often to *the of-* “ *fences*, of *particular men(e)*.” You, thus, set up your title to lampoon, and, expressly, defend all the enormities of libel, a practice, which our manners reprobate, and our laws condemn.

You appeal, for your justification, to Blackstone(*f*), who is not the best authority, in respect to libels, without the exposition of a Commentator, on *the* Commentator. Well : Blackstone does state the law, in the passage quoted by you ; but not the *whole* law. The learned Commentator is here speaking of *civil actions for libels*, and he adds : “ But, in a *criminal prosecution*,

(e) Pursuits, 7 Ed. p. 9.

(f) Ib. p. 11 : And, with your *usual fairness*, you quote chapter xi. of book iv. rather than the page, wherein is contained your own refutation.

“ the *tendency*, which all libels have to *create*,
 “ *ate animosities*, and to *disturb* the *public*
 “ *peace*, is *the whole* that the law *consi-*
 “ *ders*.” He is teaching, that, on *criminal*
prosecutions, the *truth* of the libel is not any
 defence of it: For, the tendency of *all li-*
bels, whether *true*, or *false*, to *create ani-*
mosities, and to disturb the *public peace*, is the
whole that the law considers, in a criminal
 prosecution. Now; have not your writ-
 ings created animosities; have not they a
 tendency to a breach of the public peace?
 The fact is, that *you* have been *eagerly pur-*
sued (such were the expressions reported to
 me) at the Chaplain’s table, at St. James’s,
 on account of your *Pursuits*: What, then,
 must be the animosity created, which could
 induce grave men to carry their irritation,
 to the very hazard of blows, within the
 King’s palace? This being true, in fact,
 “ the offence against the public is com-
 “ plete,” according to the authority, which
 you have produced (g). I will not insist

(g) Blackst. 12 Ed. vol. iv. p. 150.

upon

upon the literary controversy, which has been raised about your lampoons; nor upon the heart-burnings; the coldness among friends; which have all been excited by them: But, I will add, that there are other points of great concernment, which bring your writings within the penalty of law. Your frequent attacks on *Great Augustus*, during such times; and your endeavours in the spirit, and language, of *Junius*, to make the King personally answerable, for what his ministers are alone responsible; are grossly libellous. Your as frequent attacks on both Houses of Parliament, especially, on the freedom of their debates, are high offences: and Bishop Horsely, whom you constantly pursue, for his speeches in the House of Lords, might either complain of a breach of privilege in that house, or move the Court of King's Bench, against you, for an information (*b*). Upon the same principles,

(*b*) " Sooner the people's right shall HORSELY teach."
 " I allude," say you, " in your note, on this line, to
 " Bishop Horsely's *intemperate*, and *unadvised Speeches*
 " in

ciples, might the members of the House of Commons, whose speeches are attacked, either move the House, for a breach of privilege, or the King's Bench, for an information. But, the most aggravated libel, among the thousand libels, in your writings, is the attack on the House of Commons⁽ⁱ⁾, for granting money towards the relief of the emigrant French clergy, and laity: To publish the proceedings of the House, without the consent of the Speaker, is a breach of privilege; to publish them, untruly, is an aggravation; and to publish such proceedings, falsely, as you have done, in this case, with the design of rendering the representatives of the people, sitting in parliament, odious in the eyes of their constituents, is a libel of the most enormous malignity. I may now, I trust, repeat, with regard to your Pursuits; to your *Epistle to*

"in *Parliament*. Bishop Horsely, and Mr. Wyndham, should be more attentive in this particular."
[Pursuits, 6 Ed. p. 256.]

(i) Pursuits, 4th Part, 3 Ed. pref. xix.

the

the Marquis of Buckingham; to your Shade of Pope:

"Sweet scrawls! to fly about the streets of Rome:

"What's this, but *libelling* against the Senate?"

Thus much, then, in respect to public libels! With regard to libels, on persons in situations of particular trust, and on *private men*, you have quite overlooked them, in your favourite authority: You entirely forget, that for every libel on an individual, the same individual has an action against you, for damages; and, what is of more importance, for reparation of his character: On this head, the law seems to be now clearly settled, "that whatever renders a
"man ridiculous, or lowers him, in the
"esteem, and opinion of the world,
"amounts to a libel; though the same ex-
"pressions, if spoken, would not have
"been defamation (*k*)."
This is laid down as law, in reference to private persons: But, when it speaks of libel against officers in high employments or trusts, or against ma-

(*k*) 3 Blackst. Com. Ed. 12. p. 125, in the Note (6).

gistrates, it assumes a higher tone. In all your *Pursuits* you pursue the King's minister, with the unrelenting spirit of lampoon: In your last publication, *The Shade of Pope*, (l), you say, "the want of œconomy (I know what I advance) is the chief and prominent defect of Mr. Pitt's administration." This, indeed, is a note on the following lines.

"Supplies are prompt for Pitt's directing hand;

"Pæctolus rolls through all the wealthy land:

"Hence, Palaces for Bankrupt-Bankers rise,

"And Monarchs wonder with inquiring eyes." (m)

On questions of libel, our Judges have said, "We will see what every eye sees; we will understand what is obvious to every intellect." You accuse Mr. Pitt, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer, of want of œconomy: and you support your unfounded assertion, by stating, that he applies the *supplies*, which are *promptly* granted by Parliament, to build private palaces, for unworthy individuals (n). Without noticing the scur-

(l) *Shade of Pope*, p. 38.

(m) *Ib.* p. 38-9. (n) *Id.*

rility of those passages, which is below contempt, I will say, that they amount to an actionable libel, which is as malignant in its principle, as it is odious in its application. From that exalted character, I will now turn to one of lower degree, indeed, but equally entitled to the protection of law :

" Then let the learned page once quit your sight,
 " Some *Scotch* Greek *swindling* printer steals your right."

In your note, upon this text, you apply your charge, expressly, to " the *Scotch* " *Printer FOWLIS* (o)," to whose Printing-house at Glasgow, our scholars owe much, for the accuracy, and neatness, of the Greek Classicks. This, then, is exactly the sort of libel, which the Judge, who is mentioned by a very judicious law-writer (p), reprobated from the bench : " If the party had " been a *common swindler* (as alledged), the " defendant ought to have indicted him ; " but he had no right to libel him in that " way : " To publish of a tradesman, that he

(o) Pursuits, 6 Ed. p. 114-15.

(p) Wooddeson, vol. iii. p. 182.

is a *swindler*, is, therefore, actionable: And the injured Fowlis is entitled to reparation, for an injury, which has been done him, by your imputation on his character, founded on the grossest misrepresentation.

Such is your libel on a tradesman, who is connected with literature! Your lampoons on men of science, and men of learning, are without number. If it be true, in law, "that whatever renders such persons ridiculous, and lowers them in the esteem of the world," is a libel, what must be the whole of your *Pursuits*? Your attack on Doctor Warton, who is far your superior, as a poet, as a scholar, as a critic, and, perhaps, I do not say too much, if I add, as a man, is an actionable libel. What you repeatedly say of the King's historiographer for Scotland, is an actionable libel.

"Or I could scribble for historick fame,

"Like Gillies, feeble, formal, dull, and tame." (q)

(q) "The epithets in the verse, you add, in your Note upon the Couplet above, are designed to characterize the Writings of Dr. Gillies." [*Pursuits*, 6 Ed. p. 76-8.]

Yet;

Yet; with all those libels, both public, and private, in your *Pursuits*, you felicitate yourself, “ that in *your work*, there is no-
“ thing blasphemous, immoral, treasona-
“ ble, schismatical, seditious, or scanda-
“ lous (r).” As you, no doubt, know the meaning of your own terms, you call on the *ignorant men* to produce, publickly, something like proofs of those imputations. I will briefly state mine. In one of your notes, you compare your own affected feelings to our Saviour’s agony in the garden, which several divines have noticed as *blasphemous* (s). There is such a perpetual contradiction, between your principle and practice in your *Pursuits*, as to render the whole, immorally, dishonest: Your warm recommendation of JUNIUS, whose Letter was adjudged a treasonable libel, for attacking the King’s *impeccability*, is, itself, trea-

(r) *Pursuits*, 7th Ed. [11]

(s) *Pursuits*, 6 Ed. p. 174, Note [r], which ends with the blasphemous comparison. You also parody the Scriptures, most irreligiously, [Ib. p. 70:] And again, [Ib. 13.]

sonable :

sonable : Your attempt to divide Christians, by reviving, and embittering, the Roman Catholick controversy, at a time when all Christians ought to unite against Atheists, is schismatical : Your whole book, as far as it relates to public men, and public measures, is highly *seditionous* ; there being a constant endeavour throughout, to separate the governed from the governors, and the government from the constitution : And, the very essence of the luminous pages of *your Pursuits* is avowed *scandal*. Yet ; you possess not the magnanimity of Dryden, who honestly acknowledged, “ I am sensible of the scandal, I have given by my loose writings, and make what reparation I am able.”

But, you maintain that, “ under these *restrictions*,” you have an undoubted right, to lay your sentiments before the world, on public subjects, public men, and public books, in *any manner you think proper* (1). Under this claim, when speaking of the parliament, you commit several

(1) Pur. 7 Ed. p. 11.

breaches of privilege; saying of the Commons, assembled in Parliament, what is positively false: In animadverting on the King's ministers, you write concerning the Chancellor of the Exchequer what is equally false: In speaking of books, you state every thing that is unfair, and what is libellous against the authors: and you go on, in a tone of arrogant reclamation; to insist, "If I am [be] denied this *right*, [of doing " *wrong*,] there is an end of the freedom " of the press (*u*).” Yet, Blackstone, your own authority, would have instructed you, had you looked into his context, that there has never been a time, since the revival of learning, and the epoch of printing, when the right, or the practice, of publication existed, without responsibilities; a responsibility to the public prosecutor, for what regards the public; and a responsibility to the individual, for any offence, which might be offered to him: It is apparent, then, as your own Mentor would have

(*u*) Pursuits, 7 Ed. p. 5.

taught you, that though you might publish, without any previous restraint, yet the subsequent responsibility ought to have operated as a prior defeasance of the right. It is, therefore, absurd, and jacobinical, to say, that you may do what you think fit, if you be answerable for your misdeeds. If you will not be instructed by your own *sage*, it may be remarked of you, as of other "*wilful men*, the injuries, which they themselves procure, must be their *schoolmasters*."

Nevertheless, what is there in this *freedom of the press*, more than in any other right? Are there any *absolute rights*? Or are all rights only *relative*, as between the public, and individuals? *Wilfulness*, indeed, may claim *a right to do wrong*; but, justice will never admit the pretension: So, the *tongue* has no title to the freedom of *speaking evil of dignities*, nor the hand any privilege to scribble prosaical poetry, or ungrammatical prose, which is a lampoon upon scholars, and a degradation of learning. You

You would do well, to recollect how often
 “ *headstrong liberty* is lashed with woe.”

Of all rights, indeed, the right of writing and publishing, what one thinks, which constitutes *the liberty of the press*, is the least *absolute*: It is only a *concurrent* right, which every man, every woman, and every child, enjoys, as fully as you enjoy the same right: It is the same *concurrent* right, as the right of driving on the highway; whereon, if, with malicious, or ignorant, self-sufficiency, you drive against, and damage, any woman’s coach, or any man’s cart, the law will compel you to make that reparation, which, for the wrong, justice shall prescribe. When you are enthroned in your dictatorial chair, clothed in your robe of conceit, with your Gyges’ ring on your demonstrative finger, what better right have you, than I have, to think, write, and publish? Yes: I am a SATIRIST, say you, authorized by *ourselves* to reform learning, and to preserve *the State*: “ The paramount necessity of securing to this Kingdom her political and religious existence,

“istence, and the rights of society, have
 “urged me to this endeavour to preserve
 “them (x).” Well: the French offer
 liberty to every people; telling them, “that
 “when you are FREE, you shall *do as we*
 “PLEASE.” *You* come forward, on this
 libertine principle; to secure the state, by
 attacking the government; and to reform
 literature, by obliging every scholar to write,
 as *you dictate*. In the French tone, you say,
 BE FREE: and all is safe, from “the war-
 “hoop of Jacobins, from the shrieks of
 “Witlings, from the feebleness of poetasters (y):”
 The state is secure, while
ourselves threaten the national plunderers (z):
 It is enough:

“——— OURSELF still, still, remain,
 “Cerberian forehead, and Cerberian brain!”

With all this severity, you have your
 softer moments. In drawing characters, you
 screen yourself under the mantles of THEO-
 POMPUS, and La Bruyere. Lord COKE’S

(x) Pursuits, 7 Ed. p. 5. (y) Ib. p. 11.

(z) Ib. the Advert. p. iii.

ring; *Lex est tutissima cassis*; had been a better safeguard, than either the furtout of Theopompus, or the blanket of La Bruyere:

"But, many passages, in your Pursuits, are
"best defended, say you, by the Apology of
"Horace (*a*). I shall offer no other apo-
"logy. As to my supposed arrogance, a
"poet will be sometimes warmed, with the
"dignity, and importance of his subject." (*b*)

In answer to *your Apology*, I will only sub-join what Lady Mary Wortley said to Pope:

"Horace can laugh, is delicate, is clear;
"You, only, coarsely rail, or darkly sneer."

I will here close my proofs of your IMPERTINENCE; of which we have had more than enough: And, I will now proceed to submit

PROOFS of *your* MALIGNITY:

I have already given so many proofs of your malignant practices, that a few examples will be amply sufficient, to establish my position.

(*a*) Pursuits, p. 12.

(*b*) Pursuits.

" But, on the *mitred Oath* that Tucker swore

" Parr wisely ponder'd, and his Oath forbore."

You explain your text by your note: " Joseph Tucker, D. D: [the] Dean of Gloucester once took an oath in a pamphlet that he would refuse a bishoprick." (b) Yet, the fact is, that Dean Tucker never took such an oath, either *in* a pamphlet, or *out* of a pamphlet. If malignancy had any memory, you would have recollected, that the worthy Dean, who merits well of his country, for freeing it from prejudices, was justly intitled to repose at the age of *four score*. The same spirit led to a similar attack on Mr. Bryant. In defence of your *Caninity*, you refer to a passage in his *Mythology*, which does not exist in it. You mis-state that learned writer; in order to obtain, by means of misrepresentation, the imputed sarcasm of Mr. Bryant on *the Hierarchy* (c). This, indeed, is your usual

(b) Pursuits, 7 Ed. p. 217-18. Your *mitred Oath* is nonsense; because an Oath cannot be *mitred*.

(c) Pursuits, 7 Ed. p. 92; wherein Bryant's *Mythology*, vol. i. p. 329, is quoted, for what is not in the book.

practice:

practice: But, neither time, nor space, allows me to quote many examples of your misrepresentations, for the purpose of lampoon. A most remarkable instance is your attack on *Foulis*, the printer, of Glasgow, whom, with malignant pen, you call a *swindler*. A bookseller, who is noted at once for his distinctness, and his probity, and knew the transaction informed me, that it was, *grossly misrepresented in your Pursuits* (d).

Indeed,

(d) Pursuits, 6 Ed. p. 114-15: Mr. Peter Elmsly, who is never to be mentioned but with praise, told me, " That some London Booksellers, he, and Foulis, the " Printer, undertook to publish an Octavo Edition of the " *Greek Tragedians*, from a German Edition, and at the " same time to get Mr. Professor Porson to correct the " text, and to add some *Scholia*. The learned Professor " agreed; *the Copy*, consisting of the corrected text, and " the promised *Scholia*, was sent to Foulis, who printed " part of the projected edition: But, Mr. Elmsley losing " his health, and being unable to superintend the work, " the whole project failed. Whereupon Foulis, who " had thus an interest in *the Copy*, undertook to print " eighty Copies of the *Æschylus*, in a folio form, without any *Scholia*; in doing which he made use of Mr. " Professor Porson's printed text, as far as it went,

Indeed, all those, who did not know your habits of malignity, were easily led by your context, to suppose, that Mr. Professor Porson had communicated his corrected *Æschylus* to some Lord Monboddo, or other Greek scholar, in Scotland, who, regardless of the trust reposed in him, had delivered “to some
“ Scotch, Greek, swindling, printer,” the sacred transcript. By a little extension of your malice, you in the same manner misrepresent all other Scotchmen, as equally unfit for trust(e). Of the maligner, and the maligned, it may be remarked, that,—

“ His will is most malignant; and it stretches

“ Beyond you to your friends.”

As I have already shewn *who*, and *what* you are, I will now submit

PROOFS

“ without asking his consent. For this inattention to
“ the Professor, the printer was advised to make an
“ apology: But, he never did;” saying, that his affairs had been materially injured, by the failure of the projected Edition in Octavo. *The Copy* was brought back from Scotland, in 1797, and returned to Mr. Professor Porson. Such is the fact! and such is the offence!

(e) “ No Scotchman near, no Gillies by my side.”

[Pursuits, 6 Ed. p. 339.]

PROOFS of your JACOBINISM.

Barruel, and Robison, have written histories of Jacobinism; tracing it through all its windings; exhibiting it in all its varieties; illustrating its principles, and shewing its effects: Yet, Jacobinism, like wit, may be more easily described, than accurately defined, and more grievously felt, than readily found. The Parliaments of the sister Kingdoms have instituted inquiries upon the point; have pursued it in all its associated forms; have penetrated into all its disguises, exposed it in all its subtleties; and deplored all its grievous effects on individuals, and on states: Like the tree, it is every where best known by its genuine fruits, anarchy, plunder, and bloodshed.

Nay, Sir; am I a Jacobin? Have not I made a laborious endeavour, considering the wayward nature of the times, and the paramount necessity of securing to this kingdom her political and religious existence, to preserve the rights of society (f)? Have I not

(f) Pursuits, 7 Ed. pref. 5.

declared,

declared, that the constitution of Great Britain, even with all its real, or apparent defects, is worthy of continuance (g). Yes: you have written a *satirical poem*; with notes, in libellous prose: you have written epistles in the same style: And, avowing your right to publish *personal* satire, you have lampooned all parties and persons; you have, under this jacobinical claim, spoken evil of dignities; and you have attacked our establishments, religious, civil, and literary. During these *wayward times*, this inconsistency of your general practice, with your avowed principle, is, itself, a strong proof of Jacobinism; because the workings of the heart are best known, by the operation of the hand: For, as you remark, *it is written, I hope we all know where*, “out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.”

The King, as the Sun of our system, does infinite good, but *can do no wrong*. If you were not a Jacobin, that royal immunity would have saved his sacred character from

(g) Ib. p. 7.

your jacobin animadversions. In your *Chinese Epistle* there are too many "scoffs, and
"scorns, and contumelious taunts," at the
King, and his ministers, if your pursuits
were fair, or your purpose honest. And, in
the same jacobin spirit, speaking of the me-
lancholy Gray, you say:

"Dark was his morn of life, and bleak the Spring,

"Without one soft'ring ray from *Britain's King*."

You add, in your note, "*I wish*, that the
"royal favour had been *offered* to the first
"poet and the first scholar of the age." (b)
Who was to tell, that an Eton boy would be
the first poet, and first scholar of his age?
When Gray at length did show, that he was
a poet, "he was offered *the laurel*, after the
"death of Cibber," as Johnson distinctly told
you (i): And, you therefore, malign *Bri-
tain's King*, with jacobin tongue. In this
jacobin spirit, you immediately ask:

"Saw you not Malon stand with down cast-eye,

"While *great Augustus* pass'd unconscious by?"

You add, however, in answer to your own

(b) Pursuits, 7 Ed. p. 53. (i) Life of Gray.

question,

question, Mr. Mason "must have been overlooked for a *particular reason*;" acknowledging at the same time, if you were serious, the King's discernment in poetical merit. While you are warm with your jacobinical purpose to degrade greatness, you forget, that Mason was, all his life-time, a growling republican; that Gray, after receiving the unsolicited appointment of professor of modern history, never discharged the duties of the office.

(A) Yet; what are these instances of your jacobinism, to your propagation of JUNIUS; as if the reproduction of a libel were not itself a libel: You put that adjudged libel, which attacked the king's person, into the hands of our liberal youth; in order to instruct them in constitutional knowledge. Yet, all this while, JUNIUS was only Hugh M'Aulay, who was born in the county of Antrim, during 1747; and in 1769, at the age of two and twenty, came over to England, to teach jurisprudence to the venerable Mansfield, and the English language to Englishmen—

" — From

“ ——— from the rattling tongue

“ Of saucy and ambitious eloquence(k).”

JUNIUS,

(k) As you had, in 1780, celebrated JUNIUS, in your *Heroic Epistle* to the Rev. Dr. Watson; so in your Pur. 7 Ed. p. 4, you call JUNIUS “ a great and consummate writer.” You again speak of the Constitutional knowledge of JUNIUS [Ib. 6th Ed. p. 273.] You renew your panegyric, in the 7th Ed. p. 119: “ I quote JUNIUS, in English, as I would Tacitus, or Livy, in Latin. I consider him, as a legitimate English Classic.” If you had not given so many specimens of your own English style, the recommendations of Junius, as an *English Classic*, would alone demonstrate your profound knowledge of the English language. We may easily suppose that, as Junius was not naturally overburdened with embarrassment, his opprobrious Letter to *Britain's King* was elaborated with all his skill. I will say nothing of the matter of a composition, which the law still reprobates, as a treasonable libel. For the benefit of our liberal youth, however, I will briefly examine the language of this *English Classic*: He begins: “ It is the misfortune of your life, and originally [was] the cause of every, &c.” Who, but a boy from *Antrim*, would write originally *is* ?” “ And [is] originally the cause of every reproach and distress, which has” [have.] Who but a youth, who had been taught English by an Irish Woman, at Antrim, would make the singular verb *has* agree with the plural nominatives

reproach

JUNIUS, then, was an *United Irishman* by birth, by habit, and by practice; with

reproach and distress? Again: "If England *was* [were] sold to France: If resentment still prevails." Moreover: "The rays of royal indignation, collected upon him, served only to illuminate, and could not consume" [him.] This passage, which was, no doubt, thought vastly fine, is egregiously defective, by wanting *the object*, that I have supplied. Here is another blunder of the same kind: "He will soon fall back into his natural station,—A silent Senator, and hardly supporting the weekly eloquence of a news-paper." This last clause ought to stand thus: "A silent Senator, and the feeble supporter of a weekly news-paper." Such are the blunders, in one letter, of a writer, whom you recommend as, an *English Classic*: And such are the blunders, which disgrace the Edition of JUNIUS, published by the writer himself: He did not, then, know how to write English, any more than you know what is English, when you read it in your mother tongue. The Letters of JUNIUS, which I have lately run over, with a view to his language, are full of such egregious blunders. In the five and twenty years, which elapsed, between the writing of *Junius* and the publication of *The Indian Observer*, Mac Aulay, who had extraordinary capabilities from nature, greatly improved his style, by habit, and reflection: This last work of his able hand is written much better than the first; although the Critics are still blinded, by the false glare of *Junius*.

all

all the talents, subtlety, and sedition, of his fraternity: And, consequently, when you recommend to the public a book, which has been stigmatized by law, you thereby act upon the same principles, avow the same opinions, and practise the same jacobinism (1).

With

(1) I observe, that you more than once attribute the writing of *Junius's* letters to the late William Gerard Hamilton, who was, surely, incapable of writing papers, so puerile, so malignant, so seditious: You did not recollect, when you made those assertions, from the *highest authority*, that the books, and manuscripts, of W. G. Hamilton have come to the hammer, without disclosing a secret, which was not to be disclosed. [Chinese Epistle, p. 5.] Considering it of some importance to ascertain, who was the real Author of those letters, I have collected documents, which completely satisfy me, that Hugh Mac Aulay, who assumed the name of Boyd, was the real Author: He had all the genius, all the secrecy, all the malignancy, all the seditiousness, which were necessary for such a task: And it should be recollected by those Critics, who dictate on this subject, that there is no *erudition* in Junius, nor *official* detail: There is no sort of knowledge, in Junius, but what could be easily picked up at Court, or in Coffee-houses, by such boys, as Mac Aulay, or Chatterton: I say at Court; because it is a fact, that Mac Aulay, constantly, went to St. James's,

as

With the same spirit, you attack the Parliament, during *these wayward times*:

"If from *State farces*, when the House is up,

"Some seek the green room and with Kemble sup^(m)."

One of these *state farces* is minutely dramatized: and, in order that the dullest reader may comprehend the satire, you subjoin, as usual, your note, to instruct him in the point of your lampoon: "Alluding, you add, to "the long debates on the Dog and Bitch "Bill, which is a little allegorical, sometimes unintelligible, and often ludicrous⁽ⁿ⁾." You must be ignorant, indeed, if you did not know, that this attack on the proceedings of Parliament is a breach of privilege: But your delight in lampoon-

as to a Coffee-house, for the purpose of collecting information: And, it was there, that he collected, with *his ready ears*, the half-information, which he retailed in his papers.

(m) Pursuits, 6th Ed. p. 111.

(n) Ib. p. 164-5. There is also an attack on "the "incomprehensible Cavalry Act, under George the Third "of Great Britain." [Ib. p. 323.]

ing

ing the legislature (o), induces you to take the imputation of ignorance, in that point, rather than not gratify itself.

Through *all your Pursuits*, the *Lords*, assembled in Parliament, are equally subjected to the lash of your lampoon (p). In your *Chinese Epistle*, you abound in *scoff* at the most dignified Peers: The Archbishop is scoffed at (q): The Chancellor is attack-

(o) Political Dramatist, 1795, p. 1.

The house was up; the long debate was o'er:

And Addington presided now no more:

After the rising of the House, you introduce the Minister:

" His friends from idle terrors to release,

" Pitt cast faint gleams of visionary peace."

The absurdity of this is lost in its Jacobinism: Whether your avowed purpose be to ridicule Mr. Sheridan, or Mr. Grattan, your secret principle surely directs you to animadvert on Mr. Pitt: Yet the contradictoriness of your practice to your principle ever detects your double dealing: You apologize, indeed, by saying:

" I never deviate into honest sense."

(p) *Purf.* 6th Ed. p. 256.

(q) *Chinese Epistle*, p. 16: Your imputation on the Archbishop is unfounded in the fact:

" Why slumbers the Arch-Pontiff? on the shore,

" Who from embodied dulness rouses Moore?"

You attack the Archbishop's power of conferring degrees, in your *Pair of Epistles*, p. 13.

P p

ed(r):

ed(*r*): The Bishops are satirized(*s*): And you try, by every effort of jacobinical malignity, to reduce the highest characters to a level with the lowest(*t*).

You equally bespatter both sides of the house; shewing neither respect for the ministers, nor deference to their opponents. And, you hold this *impartial pen of censure*, through all your lampoons. You peck at Mr. Pitt, and you fly at Mr. Fox: You run at Mr. Rose, and you strike at Mr. Sheridan: You lampoon Lord Loughborough, and you traduce Lord Thurlow: You bounce at Mr. Bowles, and you laugh at Lord Lauderdale: You goad Mr. J. Gifford, and you bite Mr. Barrister Erskine. Such are the facts! The motives, which produced those effects, may be traced to one of the funda-

(*r*) Chinese Epistle, p. 11:

“ Yet still, though thron’d in Thurlow’s *rightful* place,

“ His words want weight which never wanted grace.”

According to your jacobinical code, Lord Thurlow had *the right*, though the King had delivered *the Seal* into fitter hands.

(*s*) *Ib.* p. 14-16. (*t*) *Id.* 11-18.

mental

mental principles of jacobinism; viz. an endeavour to confound characters, the good with the bad; and, thereby, to teach mankind to trust to all-confounding anarchy: By your indiscriminate censure, you would reduce the British dominions to the most pitiable state, which a nation can fall into, when driven, by jacobinical artifice, to despair; having shown, that there is no man, in whom it can trust for safety, nor pillow, whereon to rest its head. You have, however, your answer at hand: You are resolved, with your usual arrogance, which *the dignity of the subject demands*,

“ A while to war with dunces, fools, and knaves,

“ Hirelings of State, or Opposition Slaves.”

The same principle of jacobinism incites you to war with *Scotland* and the *Scots*:

“ ————— though Scotland's Star

“ Shed brief malignant heat, and scorch'd afar (u).”

(u) *Chinese Epistle*, p. 28: In your *Pair of Epistles*, p. 23, you say:

“ And Gillies rules o'er all the historic Choir:

“ *Scotch Mirrors*, and *Scotch Loungers*, in the rear:”

And, you libel the *Scotch* printer Fowlis.

You cry out:

“No *Scotchman* near, no *Gillies* by my side.”

You recollected, no doubt, how *Junius* railed at Scotsmen, and, thereby, rent the nation, thirty years ago: And you were induced by the motives of that malignant writer, to divide the North from the South; at a time, when they ought to be united, in affection, and in effort. It is a fact, which was long suspected, but is now ascertained, that it is a fundamental principle of the United Irishmen of the present day, to disunite Scotland from England, and to keep Ireland separate from both. You act upon the same jacobinical maxim of *divide et impera*, for a reason, which is worthy of your motives, and your manners:

“How can the rogues pretend to sense?”

“Their pound is only twenty-pence.”

The same manners, and the same motives, led you to raise from the grave of oblivion, where it had lain upwards of a century, and where it ought to rest in peace, the Roman catholic controversy. If you be a christian, what

what but jacobinism could induce you, while an attack is made, by atheists, on christianity itself, to inflame christians against each other? But, you thought you saw the Church in danger, because her fathers slept: Sir, the Church of England is moderate; because she feels, that she is strong: If she were weak, she would, upon your principles, set up persecution: You would, from the same motive, persuade the people, that the French emigrants, both laity, and clergy, were invited into our isle, by government, rather than thrown upon our shore, by tempest (x). You insinuate, that the King had fitted up a palace for their pleasure, rather than given them a barrack for their shelter (y). You, certainly, impeach the Parliament, for feeding the hungry, and clothing the naked: And, you would, thereby, tear from the national banner, one of its brightest *quarter-*

(x) I quote your opprobrious *Letter to the Marquis Buckingham*, on this subject: And your *Pursuits* every where.

(y) Id.

ings, its renown amongst civilized mankind, for public charity (2).

You were led by similar motives of jacobinism, to attack the King's ministers, for employing military bodies of French emigrants: And, your jacobinical temper, ac-

(2) I will not again reprobate your attacks on Parliament, as at once unconstitutional, and jacobinical; But, with regard to the vote of 540,000*l.* for the suffering Clergy and Laity of France, I will state *the fact* against *your fiction*: [Pursuits, 6 Ed. p. 220.] By an official statement, which was laid before the Select Committee of Finance of the Sums of Money, which were taken out of the Civil List revenue, for the relief of the suffering Clergy, and Laity of France, from the 5th January, 1793, to the 5th January, 1797, the same amounted to 420,600*l.* 12*s.* 0*d.*: Now; upon an average of four years, the total is only 105,150*l.* 3*s.* 2 year: Yet; because the House of Commons, by a vote, made good the sum, thus advanced, you repeatedly charge the Commons with voting, *annually*, 540,000*l.* You recur, often, to this topick of inflammation; for the obvious purpose of raising the indignation of the Constituents against their Representatives, in Parliament. Since the 5th of January, 1797, this Charity, which was before advanced out of the Civil List, has been, annually, voted by Parliament.

ording

ording with that spirit, you could not let it pass, but, break out :

“ Now, when the French *defend* us in disgrace,

“ French swords, French fraud, French priests, and French grimace(a).”

From the *sleeping fathers* of the church, and the Catholick controverfy, you turn your jacobinical attention to our learned seminaries. You lay your censorious finger on ETON-SCHOOL, as standing in need of many *new*, and *strong*, regulations. “ It is MY OFFICE,” you add, “ to speak openly and boldly(b).” It is in vain, I believe, to search the Chapel of the Rolls, for a charter, appointing you, or your fathers, the *visitors* of Eton School. Your OFFICE, then, consists in your assuming of the right to lampoon all persons, and establishments ; for the jacobinical purpose of degrading them : You lampoon the Pro-

(a) You say, in your Note, that this alludes to the French Emigrant Regiments, enrolled in the British Army ; “ a measure of Government unwise ;—a project of desperation.” [Pursuits, 6 Ed. p. 303.]

(b) Pursuits, 6 Ed. p. 257-59.

vost, and Masters, of Eton; in order to inculcate upon the boys more obedience to their superiors: Yet, the boys, you say, are licentious. You put JUNIUS into their hands; in order to instil into them habits of submission; yet, you exclaim, loudly, that the scholars form themselves into *political parties*. Such parties there will be, while fathers and mothers, uncles and aunts, female cousins and old nurses, shall continue to form parties upon the point, whether *John Styles*, or *Tom Nokes*, shall be the minister: For this unclassical vulgarity, of mentioning *Nokes*, and *Styles*, I beg your pardon: I meant to say, whether *Cicero*, or *Catiline*, shall be the King's minister. We all know what law says, that the sins of the fathers shall be visited upon the children: But, by your jacobinical code, the children's tutors are to be visited, for the follies of their fathers, and nurses.

From Eton School to King's College, Cambridge, the transition is natural. With your jacobinical cleaver, you hew down
 “ the *insigne* of a Chancellor's authority,
 “ borne

“ borne by a *mongrel*, *robustious* satellite of
“ a French Directory(c).” MY OFFICE
favours much of French authority: As a
judge, you condemn, without a hearing;
and, as the executioner, at the same time,
you mangle the condemned, with your ja-
cobinical sabre.

From King’s College, you extend the
visitatorial power of MY OFFICE to the Royal
Society. You find the members of it, in
the exercise of their chartered rights, cul-
tivating *natural knowledge*: And, in the like
character of French judge, and execution-
er, you lampoon, without a hearing, the
President, the Secretary, and the fellows,
who only knew you as their fellow, that
had solemnly engaged to support their pri-
vileges, and promote their views(d).

The

(c) Pursuits, 6 Ed. p. 61: The *barbarous* word, *in-
signe*, is repeated, in the 7th Ed. p. 309; but, the oppro-
brious words, *mongrel*, and *robustious*, were expunged.

(d) Pursuits, 6 Ed. p. 31-67-321-340; Note (q)
which is a kind of protest against the Transactions of the
Royal Society: I say nothing of its want of decency, its
want

The jacobinical authority of MY OFFICE, you easily extend, in the next place, to the Antiquary Society; which you also find in the exercise of its chartered rights; yet, in your accustomed manner, you punish the Society by mangling, with your satirical fabre, its head, body, and limbs (e). Your engagement to support the Society, and your honour to fulfil that engagement, are quite blotted by you out of your jacobinical

want of sense, its want of grammar, and its want of truth. "I would thunder in the ears of the President, and of the whole Royal Society, as a body," say you, "Nolumus leges NATURE mutari." The malignity of your imputation is blunted by your ignorance: For, you extend the famous speech of the Barons, which was spoken under Henry III. to King John's age. [Pursuits. 4th Part, p. 76.] Such a perversion of the Barons speech was to be expected from you, who talk of "*Natural Science*." You seem to think with *Dogberry* that, "To be a well-favoured man is the gift of fortune; but, to write and read comes by *nature*."

(e) Pursuits, 6 Ed. p. 59, 244: When a Satirist starts up, to censure a Society, whose object is the cultivation of polite literature, he ought at least to write common sense, in common grammar: "I believe, say you, (but see the Society's *Archæologia* for the record) that it took place before, &c." [Id.] *What* took place?

code.

code. So we have, in those examples, a true picture of jacobinism, which disregards all engagements; and allows no object, however sacred, to stand in its way, when in pursuit of its end. The Secret Committees of the Parliaments of the sister kingdoms have shewn, by incontrovertible documents, that the great object of the men, who are *united*, upon the true jacobinical principle, is, to destroy all *constituted authorities*, for the fell purpose of setting up *universal anarchy*: And, therefore, your repeated attacks, on all constituted authorities, afford an indubitable proof of your jacobinism.

Nay; have not I strongly maintained, that “Our ruin can be effected by political reform alone (*f*)?” Yes; you have written as libellously against reforms, as on any other topicks. The House of Commons being informed of supposed abuses in office, appointed a Committee to enquire into the

(*f*) Pursuits, 6 Ed. p. 209.

true

true state of all offices. As you, however, assume the character of the people's *guardian* against *public plunderers*, you speak contemptuously of this constitutional measure: And, you abuse Mr. Abbot, the Chairman of this Committee. Well: you have in a subsequent edition made a half-apology to Mr. Abbot, for this abuse; but, you have not made any apology to the House of Commons, for the breach of privilege, in attacking its Committee. The House of Commons being given to understand, that justice is impeded, and that wrong may be done, by the uncertainty of the expiration of statutes, appointed a Committee to state *the fact*. As Chairman of this Committee, Mr. Abbot again employs his abilities, his activity, to the good purpose, of doing constitutional service: And, you, therefore, fall upon him, and object to such constitutional reform (g). You act, as if you thought, that no constitutional good can be done without your advice, and no

(g) Pursuits, 4th Part, 3 Ed. p. 29.

public service performed, without your assistance. Thus, you say (*b*):

"But if in love with *fiction* still, at Court

"Present in verse some new *Finance Report*,

"How taxes, funds and debts shall disappear,

"Or in the fiftieth, or five hundredth year."

"The violence, sedition, and daring wickedness of the times (*i*)" induced his Majesty to recommend to the consideration of Parliament that violence, that sedition, and that wickedness. The Parliament, in pursuance of the royal recommendation, passed the Sedition Acts. And, you thereupon, attack the Parliament, in the following terms (*k*):

"But in the wane of Empires (mark the hour)

"Vice and the Sword consolidate all power;

"Laws pass their bounds; few Statesmen stand erect;

"All in their Country's name, themselves protect;

"The Constitution sounds in every speech,

"The words are insult, and each act a breach;

"The public hopes with public credit sink:

"At such an hour when men to madness think,

"What is a poet, what is fiction's strain?

"JUNIUS might probe a nation's wounds in vain."

(*b*) Purs. 7 Ed. p. 325. (*i*) Ib. 6 Ed. p. 273.

(*k*) Pursuits, 6 Ed. p. 273: Each *act* a breach," of what? The context points to *the Constitution*.

Well:

Well: you have subjoined a note; in order to explain, that *my* FRIEND OCTAVIUS, by this jacobinical attack, on the King, on the Parliament, on *the laws*, on “the statesmen “all,” *means nothing* (1), during “such violent, seditious, and wicked times.” You thus come forward, like a Maidstone witness, to testify for *your friend Octavius*, that his principles are the same as your own, that he conducts himself as you do, that he is a well affected, well meaning, subject, and that when he speaks, and acts, seditious jacobinism, he means nothing. As for me; I have no other mode of knowing what persons are, or mean, but by comparing their avowed principles, and their constant practice, together. I did not want the Maidstone witnesses to tell me any thing about O'Connor: I had seen his speeches, and his writings, and observed his conduct, in Ireland; I knew, that he had fled from the justice of his country; I saw him *taken with the mainour*, in the company of men of

(1) Pursuits, 6 Ed. p. 273.

bad fame, going to France: And, I inferred, from all those circumstances, that he was, what he has since acknowledged himself to be, a traitor. I did not want your *Shade of Pope* to inform me, who, or what, Mr. Grattan is: I had perused his speeches too, read his pamphlets, and seen his conduct, during twenty years: And, from those unerring data, I inferred, what the Committees of the Irish Parliament have proved, that his principles and his conduct have been consistent. The same rule of logic, I apply to you. When I see you criminate Mr. Pitt, in the same breath, that you ridicule Mr. Grattan: When I observe you animadvert, on Godwin, Thelwall, and other seditious characters, in one page, and in the next, attack the Parliament, for suppressing seditious societies, you astonish me, by the glaring inconsistency of your invariable practices with your professed principles. And, with these observations, I close MY PROOFS OF YOUR JACOBINISM.

PROOFS

PROOFS of your IGNORANCE.

I have the honour to concur with TILLOTSON, in thinking that, "He who doth
 " not know those things, which are of use
 " for him to know, is but an ignorant man,
 " whatever he may know besides." If you
 had the gift of tongues, I would treat you
 as an ignorant man, while you presume to
 teach others what you do not know your-
 self; and pretend to dictate, on every sub-
 ject, to every person: And, I am free to
 think now, as you formerly thought, "that
 " it is possible for an author not to write the
 " worse, for having some previous know-
 " ledge on the subject, about which he is to
 " treat (a)."

As my first proof; I will quote your last
 publication, *The Shade of Pope*. You as-
 sume it, as a point agreed, that the loyal
 spirit of Pope rose indignant at the residence
 of the seditious Grattan at *Twit'nam*. You

(a) *Mathias's Essay on the Evidence, relating to
 Rowley's Poems, p. 84.*

would

would not have written the worse on this topick, for having had some previous knowledge of your subject. Had you looked into Pope's Satires, you would have seen, that the *poet* was to the full as seditious, as the *politician*. Pope was, continually, lampooning *Kings*: and, when the Prince of Wales asked him, *how he could love a Prince, while he disliked Kings*, the poet had an answer to seek. In the House of Commons, Fox reproached Lyttelton, the friend of Pope, with entertaining friendship for a lampooner, who scattered his ink without fear, or decency. About this time too, Paul Whitehead was summoned before the Lords for his poem called, *Manners*: But, the whole proceeding was intended, says Johnson, rather to intimidate Pope, than to punish Whitehead. And, Pope desisted from further attempts, at reformation, by lampooning: "He was
 " not likely ever to have been of opinion,
 " that the dread of his satire could counter-
 " vail the love of power, or of money; he
 " pleased himself with *being important* and
 " formidable; and gratified sometimes his

Q q

" pride,

" *pride*, and sometimes *his resentment*; till
 " at last, he began to think, he should be
 " more safe, if he were less busy (*b*)."

What Pope thought, perhaps, you may live to think: But, my business is only with your ignorance of Pope's real character. Pope was as ignorant of the flourishing state of the nation, in 1738, as you were of its flourishing state, in 1798.

You are led, by your ignorance, to mention William Wood, and *his associates*, who were confounded by the eloquence, and energy, of Dean Swift (*c*). Yes; the *Draper* was very eloquent, like yourself, in writing of what he did not understand; and very energetic, like you, also, in opposing, not an evil, but a good. After a while, the litigated question, about Wood's *halfpence*, was referred to Sir Isaac Newton, as Master-worker of the Mint, who reported two facts: 1st. That the contract, which had been made with Wood, for supplying Ireland

(*b*) Johnson's admirable *Life of Pope*, throughout.

(*c*) *Shade of Pope*, p. 6.

with copper coins, was the most advantageous, that had ever been made, for that country: 2dly. That Wood had compleatly executed his contract. The English government would not force a good upon Ireland, at the risk of a rebellion: The Irish government rejected the copper coins, which all parties in Ireland reprobated; but Wood had a pension, which no party opposed. I have now drawn some information even out of your ignorance; and have substituted an useful moral, for your seditious application of it.

You, at length, raise the Ghost of Pope, to frighten Grattan:

“What accents, murmur’d o’er this hallow’d tomb,
“Break my repose, deep sounding through the gloom!”

In the first line of your first couplet, we see a wonderful specimen of your ignorance of the art of writing: You interpose a comma between the nominative, [accents,] and the verb, [murmur’d]. And, from that blunder the transition was easy to the impropriety of unfitly changing the tense of your verb, from the *past* to the *present*: You might in-

deed have chosen either the past, or the present form of your verb : But, as you meant to say, and sing, what accents murmur'd, and what accents broke my repose, you were bound by grammatical propriety, and your own election, to adhere to that form, which poetical vivacity required ; although poetical vivacity required rather the present form. Poor Pope ! whose chief boast is accuracy, to be thus raised from the " hallow'd tomb ;" and made to talk, so inaccurately, in a single couplet !

From Pope, the transition is not difficult to Shakspeare :

" Must I for Shakspeare no compassion feel,

" Almost eat up by COMMENTATING zeal."

In revenge, you have hunted the Commentators, through twenty pages " o'er bog and " quagmire," in the text, and notes (*d*) :

" Hot was the chase ; I left it out of breath ;

" I wish'd not *to be in* at Shakspeare's death."

This chase, which is written in the true style, and measure, of Fowldes's " Strange " wonderful battell between Frogs and

(*d*) Pursuits, 6 Ed. p. 39-60.

" Mife

“ Mife(e)” brings to my recollection a passage in the *Summer's Last-Will* of NASH:
 “ Faith, this scene is a right *prandium caninum*, a dog's dinner, which, as it is without wine, so here is a coyle about dogges, without wit.”

In every system of mythologists, nothing can be more just than, that he who has hunted others, should himself be hunted. You truly tell, indeed, what is not news to the readers of Shakspeare, that our great poet was born, in 1564, and died on his birth day, in 1616; that his plays were first collected, and published together in folio, in 1623, by his principal friends, Hemming and Condell: But, when you add, that, “ they likewise *corrected* a second edition in 1632,” you

(e) This wonderful battel was printed, in 1603: Herein may be seen, in the Frogs and Mice, the prototypes of your Dogs: Thus: Croaking Hysiboas; Clamorous Polyphon; Blown-cheek Physignathus; Lick-meale Lichomile; Eatcheese Trygroglyphus; Eatcrum Pfiaharpax: These are more poetical epithets than yours: The following is such a description of a warrior, as you give of your hounds: *Embafichytros* is a mouse that sliely creepeth into every pot.

tell news, indeed (f): For, Condel died, in 1627, and Hemming, in 1630; as you might have seen in a book, which you deride (g). As you possess the magical power of raising men from the dead, so you can, by your *hydra-beaded wilfulness*, annihilate existence; "For, life and death is in thy doomful writing." You immediately add: "It may seem strange to us, but it is true, that *no other* edition of his works was attempted till eighty two years after that time, when in the year 1714, a *third* edition was published by Mr. Rowe (h)." You thus annihilate, by your *doomful writing*, the folio editions of 1664, and of 1683, and the 8vo edition of 1709. And, you, therefore, demonstrate, by *your own showing*, what it is to be a *Shakspearean Commentator* of the Warburtonian school.

From your vast knowledge of Shakspearean history, you give a list of *Old Plays*, in which you include *Banks Bay horse in a trance*,

(f) Pursuits, 7 Ed. p. 91. (g) Apology, p. 436-39.

(h) Pursuits, 7 Ed. p. 91,

and *Peirce Pennyless's* Supplication to the Devil; but these were never dramatized until you issued your Shakspearean fiat.

You have, in addition to all other great qualities, the knack of being *right pleasant*, when you blunder most; and of being vastly witty, by egregious interpolation, only. "The first chapter of Markhams Booke of Armorie is intituled, The difference *between Charles and Gentleman*," say you⁽ⁱ⁾. The passage, as quoted by the late Dr. Farmer, is, "the difference 'twixt *Cburl* and *Gentlemen* ^(k)." If you had looked into Bailey, for the meaning of *Cburl*, your ignorance would have been saved such a blunder. But, why interpolate several *&c.* for the purpose of sarcasm? And, why immediately add, "Reader, Mr. Steevens, and Dr. Farmer will tell you *all this is so*, and *quoted* too, though you may begin with *a staring doubt*." Steevens, and Farmer will tell you all this, and *quoted* too!! What

(i) Pursuits, 7 Ed. p. 81.

(k) Steev. Shaks. 1793, vol. ix. p. 441, which is quoted by you upon the point.

blunder! What interpolation! What nonsense! Let false grammar be added to these (l); and we shall have compleat specimens of your performances, as a Shakspearean Commentator.

Your sagacity cannot divine, it seems, by what refined absurdity *the wills* of the actors could be *raked up*, to illustrate Shakspeare (m). Why; Sir, wills are not to be *raked up* at Doctors Commons: It requires some research to discover wills there; and some expence to obtain copies of them, for any purpose. The players' wills were not published by Mr. Malone, nor by me, for the purpose of illustrating Shakspeare's Dramas; but for the important objects, of illustrating his life, and clearing the dark history of the stage, during his interesting age. It is, however,

(l) Whether their own drowsiness, *and* that of their brother Commentators, *was* [were] in consequence? [Pursuits, 7 Ed. p. 83] If I *am* [be] rightly informed:—If he *does* [do], Mr. Steevens and Co. [Messrs. Steevens and Co.]—What can be more despicable, than *the drowsiness* of *such a scholar*, with his ungrammatical improprieties, and his learned follies,

(m) Pursuits, 7 Ed. p. 97.

apparent

apparent, that the publishing of the wills of Hemming, and Condel, did not prevent you from making these players the editors of the Dramas of Shakspeare, *after they* had been some years dead. To true merit ought to be assigned the palm : And, therefore, the *blunderbuss*, who can make *dead* players *living* editors of Shakspeare, is justly entitled to the honours of the *fools-cap*, and *bawble*.

What! Sir, do you call me a blunderbuss, who am now, what Gray lately was, the first scholar, and the first poet in England? Yes: I will call any writer a *blunderbuss*, who scribbles, blunderingly; and yet pretends to dictate to those, who know more than he, upon the point discussed. "Consuls," say you, "do not now meet consuls in Tuscum; and if I am [be] rightly informed, the *Symposiacks* [Symposiarchs] at Wimbledon, and Holwood, have not too much severity of method or equality in the [their] glasses (n)." In this paragraph, you, no doubt, intended, to be profoundly

(n) Pursuits, 7 Ed. p. 13.

learned,

learned, and vastly witty: But, how came you, as the first scholar, to use the adjective, *Symposiacks*, in place of the substantive, *Symposiarchs* (o); as your context shows, that you meant to speak of the *landlords*, and not of their *feasts*? In your *severity of method*, and *equality in the glasses*, you add nonsense to blunder. Wit, and blunder, cannot coalesce. When a writer, who stands upon the stilts of learning, introduces into a short passage bad sense, bad grammar, affectation, blunder, he only shows himself in the character of a blunderbuss! But, you have your answer at hand: "If I culminate at all, it is from the equator (p)." A navigator may sail, from the Equator to the Pole, before he shall discover the meaning of this *culmination* of ignorance, which rises to the very *vertex* of nonsense.

Yet; you have risen above your own *culmination*, in the perspicuous passage following: "The time for discrimination seems

(o) For the several meanings of *Symposiacks*, and *Symposiarchs*; compare Johnson, Bailey, and Ash.

(p) *Pursuits*, 7 Ed. p. 272.

" to be come. Toleration is fully granted
 " to all opinions, subject to the controul of
 " *the legislature*, after their publication, in
 " the open courts of law, by the verdict of a
 " jury, in which true liberty consists (q)."

It is certainly high time for *discrimination* to interpose: For, chaos seems come again. Toleration is allowed, *fully*, when it is exercised under the controul of the *legislature*; not, indeed, acting in its place, and character, of the legislature; but, in the courts of law, as superintendant of judicial proceedings; and, in this superintendence of the legislature over the judicial power, *true liberty* consists, according to your theory; although, according to Montesquieu's system, such a superintendence is real tyranny.

But, the culminations of ignorance are confined to neither time, nor space:

" Though Abram Jones and Jasper Wilson preach,

" With names uncouth, but *not unpolish'd speech* (r)."

(q) Pursuits, 7 Ed. p. 62.

(r) Pursuits, 6 Ed. p. 166: *Names uncouth*, "instead
 ' of *Cato*, Brutus, &c." You are a true son of Mistress
 Dangle, for your admiration of "*Roman Signatures*."

In your accustomed appendage of note, you add, "I more than suspect the celebrated Mr. Roscoe of Liverpool in Jasper Wilson (s)." As a logician, you place your *more than suspect*, in opposition to my *positive information*, which, decidedly, gave the work of Jasper Wilson, to Dr. Currie. As an historian, you come forth with that *more than suspect*, after Doctor Currie, like a man, has avowed the publication, and like a spirited man, has made an exposition of his principles. As a friend to the constitution, you would refix in the side of Government a thorn, which had been extracted, by my little efforts. As a judge of the Olympick games, you assign the prize, accompanied with Pindaric praises, not to the victor, but to the vanquished. Ignorance cannot culminate higher in the smoke of blunder, nor grovel lower in the mire of affectation!

(s) You often repeat the praises of Mr. Roscoe: But, from your partiality to republican principles, you shut your eyes upon his republicanism, which is perpetually breaking out, in his writings; nor do you open them upon a well-known club of Jacobins at Liverpool.

What!

What! Sir, do you attribute ignorance to me, who sit in the dictatorial chair, with Gyges' ring on my critical finger? Have not I instructed every scholar, that Juvenal was born at Acquinum, Persius at Volterra, and Lucilius at Arunca? Yes: But, had not Harwood already taught our children the same petty points, when he put into their hands "The Lives and Characters of the Greek and Roman Classics"? Nay; have not I quoted, not from those Classics only, but from books, in every science, and in every language? Yes:

"In ancient sense, if any needs will deal,

"Be sure, I give them fragments, not a meal;

"What Gellius, or Stobæus hath'd before,

"Or chew'd by blind old Scholiasts o'er and o'er."

Gellius was a minute critic: Stobæus gave his common place book to the public, wherein we happen to find such mincemeat of old books. [MAT.] You may, indeed, acknowledge, in the words of Balandino, the Pageant Poet to the City of MILAN, in Ben Jonson's *Case is Altered*: "Why; I'll tell you, Master Onion, I do use as much *stale stuff*, though I say it myself, as any man

“ man does, in *that kind*, I am sure. Did
 “ you see the last Pageant, I set forth?”
 yeleft, *The Shade of Pope*.

Nay; have not I shown my extensive *no-ignorance* by translating, in the character of a friend, “ the passages from [the] Greek, Latin, Italian, and French writers quoted “ in the Pursuits of Literature?” Yes: and you have stumbled at the threshold, by committing a blunder, in the title-page; as I have shewn above; and in the last page; as it thus appears: “ End [*the* End] of the “ fourth and last dialogue, &c.” You, who defy a commentary (*t*), cannot translate your own quotations. You have false grammar, in the very first article of your translation (*u*). In your second trial, you have impropriety of pointing, besides false grammar; But, I will not dwell upon the egregious pleonasm of your “ mere babble of

(*t*) Pref. p. xlvii.

(*u*) Pref. p. lxxix: “ The merit, however, of the “ cause itself, and of the warfare in which she is engaged, “ joined to the predilection of Stilicho, ensures [ensure] “ the affection and favour of the nation.” I do not mean to object to your *paraphrastic verbosity*.

“ words;”

"words;" the expression; *babble*, alone, conveying the whole idea of idle talk, or of *puerile translation*. In your fourth trial, you fail, in giving either the elegance, or the plain meaning of Cicero: "*Ne incognita pro cognitis habeamus* : Not to mistake what "is unknown, for what is known," say you: In every translation, two rules are indispensable; it must be grammatical; it must be idiomatical: And from both those rules, you have, in the above instance, departed egregiously. Let us take another example from Cicero, whom you attempt to translate: "*De Republica graviter querens, de homine nihil dixit* : He complained *deeply* for the sake of the state; of the man himself he said nothing." Cicero's *graviter* may be translated *heavily*, *gravely*, *wisely*, *grievously*, *soresly*, *severely*, *hardly*; but, to complain *deeply* is not idiomatical: Respect for such a philologist, and orator, as Cicero was, would induce me to attempt a translation of your quotation from him, in the following manner: Complaining, grievously, for the Republic, he said nothing of the

the man. In translating the motto to your title page, from Justin Martyr, you have again introduced bad English: "Ye, who
 " from your natural disposition [disposi-
 " tions] as well as from your education are
 " in all things, &c (x)." In the following *germannick question*, "Whether a chi-
 " mæra buzzing in a vacuum, has [have]
 " the power, &c. (y)." And there ought to be no (,) after vacuum, unless there be one after chimæra. But, I have done: I have no intention "to chase a schoolboy to
 " his common places:" Nor, have I any design to darn Sir John Cutler's stockings, which you wear, worthily, by inheritance, from the œconomical Knight: my purpose, merely, is to support my own position, by examples, that you cannot translate *into English*, your quotations from foreign languages. As you cannot write English; so you cannot possibly translate; even if your affectation did not mar your sense (z): But,
 amidst

(x) Transf. p. 1. (y) Ib. p. 12.

(z) Pursuits, p. 27: "*Magnum est vestigial parsimonia:*
 " Oeconomy is a great *possession*." Here is another ex-
 ample

amidst a thousand other defects, your great defect, both as a translator, and as a writer, is *verbosity*. With these observations, I will close *my proofs* of *your* IGNORANCE. And, adopting the mythological principle, before mentioned, I will only add :

“ So Proteus hunted in a nobler shape,
“ Became, when seized, a puppy, or an ape.”

PROOFS of *your* NONSENSE.

Ignorance, and nonsense, may certainly be regarded as cousins in the first degree; being descended from folly, and affectation, the common parents of both. Considering this descent, we need not be surprized, that satyrical nonsense should so often appear in the world of letters, sometimes, indeed, in the garb of plausibility, but oftener, with the air of arrogance :

“ Prose swell’d to verse, verse loit’ring into prose.”

Such is the importance of this subject, to

ample, which shows, that you cannot translate Cicero : *Vetigal* signifies a tax, or income, which the context required; but, not *possession*, which conveys the idea of something more stable.

R r

the

the purity of our compositions, that philosophical rhetoricians have formally inquired, "What is the cause that NONSENSE so often escapes being detected, both by the writer, and by the reader (a)?" This disquisition accounts, by anticipation, why the Critics, who have propagated your PURSUITS, have not detected the nonsense in them; and why the readers, who have perused your *prose swelled to verse*, your *poetry loitering into prose*, did not perceive, that they were reading NONSENSE:

"How fluent nonsense trickles from his tongue,

"How sweet the periods, neither said, nor sung!"

These *phenomena* may be easily accounted for, indeed, by the fact, that your writings form such a vast wilderness of *nonsense*, the *darkness visible* whereof obscures the light, both of the eye, and the understanding. But, such are the limited capacities of men, that vast objects cannot be easily compre-

(a) Campbell's Philosophy of Rhetorick, vol. ii. p. 92; wherein you may see much useful learning, and may find many beacons for your future course, although the Author was a *Scotchman*.

hended by them, without the whole be divided into its several parts: Examination may then begin; and judgment may be at last pronounced.

You seem, indeed, to have excelled the perspicuous writer;

“ Him, who now to sense, now nonsense leaning;

“ Tries but to *wheel* round about a meaning.”

This sort of writing may be illustrated by the following examples: “ The reform-
 “ ers strove to buy *golden opinions*, of their
 “ fellow citizens, and to *wear them* in the
 “ newest gloss. The external decoration
 “ deceived the eye. The painted sepulchre
 “ was prepared and whited *without*, the
 “ vault and receptacle of all our ancient
 “ liberties, and rights, and securities, and
 “ properties, and common comforts. Still
 “ we beheld all this, but went our way,
 “ and forgot what manner of men, these
 “ reformers were.” These passages were
 intended, no doubt, to be vastly instruc-
 tive; but where is the sense of them? You
 instruct your readers: “ at this very hour,
 “ when the public mind was darkened that

“ it could not discern, when in every quar-
 “ ter of Heaven appeared vapour, and mist,
 “ and cloud, and exhalation.” In order to
 dispel these accumulated vapours, you quote
 an Italian passage, from the *Inferno* of *Dante*,
 which makes darkness visible. “ It was the
 “ morning horizon began suddenly to red-
 “ den. It was the dawn. Then indeed,
 “ *first in his east the glorious lamp was seen*,
 “ regent of day ! This luminary was Ed-
 “ MUND BURKE ! ! !”

Now, has the reader daylight, indeed:
 “ The rays of *the orb* were direct, col-
 “ lected, and concentrated : They had
 “ power to illuminate, and to consume(*b*).”
 What sublime nonsense ! Yet, these pas-
 sages (*c*) may be considered, as proper spe-
 cimens of the texture of the Prefatory Dis-

(*b*) JUNIUS had said, as I have already remarked :
 “ The rays of royal indignation, collected upon him,
 “ served only to illuminate, and could not consume.”
 You borrowed this passage of JUNIUS, without perceiv-
 ing, that it is ungrammatical nonsense : This comes of
 ignorant admiration !

(*c*) Pursuits, 6 Ed. p. 124-5.

course

course to your third Dialogue, which is a tissue of false composition, thus embroidered with nonsense.

But, absolute nonsense, and false composition, may be found every where, throughout *your* PURSUITS: "If Bishop Horsey
" goes [go] on in this style, whatever his
" politics may be, he certainly never will
" incur the danger of *The Second Philip-*
" *pic.*" (d) "Not forgetting," you add,
in a subsequent page, "his lordship's *Greek*
" *profody* for Lord Thurlow and *the la-*
" *dies.*" (e) What specimens of gallant
" nonsense! I am ready to cry out, with
Marston, the ancient satirist:

"My shins are broke, with groping for some sense;

"To know to what his words have reference."

(d) *Ib.* p. 139.

(e) *Pursuits*, 6 Ed. p. 145; and the Note (r) in p. 140, for similar nonsense about the same Lords, and Ladies:

'Nay Thurlow once ('tis said) could sing or swear,

'Like *Polypheme*, "I cannot, cannot bear."

[*Ib.* p. 108:] We see in this couplet more *plagiarism* from the *Dunciad*. [8vo. Ed. p. 156.]

"Teach thou the *warbling* POLYPHEME to roar,

"And scream thyself as none e'er scream'd before."

Let us take an example of incomprehensibility, from your poetical text:

" Bleft be the voice of mercy, and the hand

" Stretch'd o'er affliction's wounds with *healing bland*,

" In holiest sympathy! Our best of man

" Gave us to tears, ere misery well began(*f*)."

If perspicuity be the chief quality of writing, what purpose can it answer to write what cannot be understood? Happy! if you would stretch out your hand, *with healing bland*, to open our eyes, *ere misery begin*, in order to see in your arithmetical syntax, that two adjectives make one substantive. You have, however, your answer at hand to every objection: This is what is called in modern jargon, *The sublime instinct of sentiment* (*g*).

" Till *wheeling round* with metaphysick art,

" You steal religion from th' unguarded heart."

But, this may be done by what you call a *strange fatality*, and in the blunder of *papal*

(*f*) Ib. p. 151. Pope, indeed, has *healing balm*.

[Ib. p. 88] But, with an eye of plagiarism on Pope, you went, far beyond his pretensions, into the regions of nonsense, by your *healing bland*.

(*g*) Pursuits, 6 Ed. p. 21.

meta-

metaphor (h); or it may be still better performed by the trick of some "young lawyers, and boy-members of Parliament, of forgetting their Greek, *if ever they knew any (i)*." Your lawyers must be, indeed, strange jurists, to forget the law, which they never learned, and your boy-parliament-men must be still more extraordinary scholars, to neglect the Greek, which they never knew. But you deal in novel-ties, as well as in *bulls*:

"Armies have *skeletons*, and sermons too(*k*);

"So teach our Doctors warlike or [and] divine."

Your usual note points out not only the meaning, and the satire, of your text, but its nonsense too: "The language of the House of Commons. It should have been in other terms. Sorrow is sacred, and should have the language of consolation even from the lips of a statesman." *What*, I wonder, should have been in other terms? You refer, for an answer, to the ske-

(*h*) Ib. p. 154. (*i*) Ib. p. 141.

(*k*) Ib. p. 343: In order to make out the lame sense, it should have been said, and sermons too *have skeletons*.

letons of sermons by Mr. Simeon. " This, " you add, is as ludicrous and absurd in a " divine, as the term is offensive and *un-* " *feeling* in *Parliament* during the miseries " of war (*l*). " But, you mitigate, in some degree, these animadversions, by remarking that, though every statesman knows the *rattles of office*; Mr. Burke, who was the God of your idolatry, could alone save England " from the grand *crushing* CABAL, " grounded and rooted in France, and " branching out and overshadowing all " Europe (*m*). I speak, as I think; in sincerity. " But, there is no end of the specimens of nonsense, which may be taken from your *Pursuits*! They grow luxuriantly, like other weeds, from a soil, which appears to be naturally suited to them. You were favoured by nature; but art seems not to have supplied the necessary cultivation of the seeds of your genius; nor, to have produced, by your education, its proper fruits:

" True

(*l*) *Pursuits*, p. 343. (*m*) *Ib.* p. 356-7.

" True Child of fortune ; and true too to fame,

" You lisp'd in nonsense ; for the nonsense came(n)."

3. I have

(n) There is, as I have said, no end to the *nonsense* in your Pursuits : I will only give a very few instances more : In 6 Ed. p. 71, you talk of " reading a *Minister in Books*." You speak of the *mitred Oath* that Tucker swore : Can an Oath be *mitred* ? Yes ; by the same pen, which could make the worthy Dean swear a *mitred Oath*, in a political pamphlet. We may suppose, that the *mitred Oath* is to be found " in some *posthumous MSS.* " of William Warburton, [the] Bishop of Gloucester." [Ib. p. 159.] But, it required, in addition to the learned Bishop's genius, which could thus write after *inhumation*, " an *insurrection* of talents." [Ib. p. 173.] Besides, you have an office, " to instruct the rising abilities, and " hope of England." [Ib. p. 198.] You can, indeed, easily erect offices, and form plans : " A distinguishing " feature in all his plans for the relief of the poor, the " idle, the abandoned, and the wretched. *The mode of " conferring mercy* and apparent kindness is *not always " mild and merciful.* I have too much respect for my " readers to enlarge on this virtue." [Ib. p. 181.] But, why not enlarge your sentiment into sense, and your style into grammar ? You, indeed, assign a satisfactory reason : " Our *unsexed* female writers now instruct, or " confuse us and themselves in the labyrinth of politics, " or turn us wild with Gallick frenzy." [Ib. p. 194.] " Are we to add corruption to corruption," you ask,
till

3. I have now finished what I had chiefly to say, with regard to *the matter* of the work, which you, originally, called *THE PURSUITS OF LITERATURE; or What you Will*. Its general subject, say you, is *Literature*; although, when you afterwards diverge to *What you Will*, you relinquish the most significant part of your well chosen Title-page. It is a *satirical poem*, with

"till there neither is, *nor can be*, a return to virtuous action?" [Ib. p. 198.] "Are we to spare," you exclaim, "the sharpest instruments of authority and of censure, when public establishments are gangrened in the *life organs*?" [Ib. p. 199.] It is not surprizing, then, though you think it unfortunate, "that scarce a subject in literature can be interesting without the science and matter of politics." [Ib. p. 205.] As you have your *science of politics*; so have you your *state botany*; and your *public virtuais*: For according to your *science of politics* "the State has no decent awe." [Ib. p. 293.] How could it? considering that "Dr. Morosophos," whom you brought from the *Scribbleriad*, "knew but little of the system of the Lydian mode in the diatonick genus." [Ib. p. 290.] How could he, even with the help of Bishop Horfey, whom you ridicule, in the next sentence, because he put down a jacobinical pretender to Greek learning, know any thing of your *system of a mode in a genus*?

Notes,

Notes, say you: And, you have since assumed the more arrogant denomination of a NATIONAL poem(o). An attack, indeed, on all parties, and all persons, excepting the chosen few, is fitly called a national poem; artfully composed, with "half maxims, and half whim:" And, such a poem is very properly accompanied with a well noted margin; as nothing can be more inconsistent, amidst so much inconsistency, than notes of elucidation, to clear up the darkness of the text; to explain the incom-

(o) A writer in the *True Briton* of the 27th of October, 1797, under the signature of "A Friend to the Constitution, &c." emphatically, calls the *Pursuits of Literature*, "the NATIONAL Poem." In this *Puff-oblique*, the hand of the celebrated Mr. PUFF himself, manifestly, appears. In the series of letters, which are, at present, publishing in the *Morning Herald*, under the signature of HORATIO, the *Pursuits of Literature* are, again, called the NATIONAL Poem: And, again the encomiastic hand of the great PUFF himself appears, in every paragraph of *Horatio's Letters*. MATHIAS is a mannerist: And, when he does his best, his style, and sentiment, his purpose, and his *Puff*, manifest themselves so plainly, that it is impossible not to see him, in his proper person, and in his true character.

prehen-

prehensible, and to point the dull. I mean to say little of your want of any previous plan, or of *honest* purpose. Of your plan, you write about it, and about it, that although it be not a *mock-epick*, with a beginning, a middle, and an end, it is a *dramatick* EXCURSUS:

“In thundring lines, your no-design rehearse;

“And rant, and rumble, in a storm of verse.”

As a proof of your *no-design*, let it be remembered, that, although your subject be *literature*, which you say, truly, is interwoven into the web of our *politics*, you observe nothing about the *faction*, consisting of *the* REVIEWERS, that domineers, in our *Literature*. The public, feeling the evil influence of that faction, encouraged competitors, in the same department of letters. After a while these competitors became themselves factious, though upon a different principle. The Public now called for Reviewers of *the* Reviewers; and the public, without the benefit of your help, derived a manifest advantage, from encouraging competition, and discountenancing factiousness. On this subject, which is so intimately connected

ned with our constitution, in church, and state, you are, studiously, silent. By attacking all our establishments, ecclesiastical, civil, and literary, you have engaged the repeated applause of the *Monthly Review*: By animadverting on Thelwall, and Godwin, on Volney, and Priestley, you have secured the indiscriminate praises of the *British Critic*. Thus much, then, with regard to your *plan*, and your *purpose*. I will now proceed to submit the very little, I have to add, about *the MANNER* of your *Pursuits*.

PROOFS of *your inability* to write POETRY.

I will produce, as my *first proof*, the very *first couplet* of your boastful poem :

" I, who *once deem'd* my race of labour run,

" And camps, and courts, and crowds, and senates,
shun (a)."

Now ; here is a sad stumble at the very threshold. You, who had chosen your own tense, were obliged to follow up your *once deem'd*, and run, in the first line of the cou-

(a) *Pursuits*, 7 Ed. p. 45.

plet,

plet, which are thus doubly in the past time, with the past tense, in *shun*, in the second line of it; and your construction ought to have been, I, who once deem'd, and shunn'd; as in Dryden:

"So Chanticleer, who never saw a fox,

"Yet shunn'd him, as a sailor shuns the rocks(b)."

Nay; Sir, say you, shunn'd would ruin the rhyme. Your answer is only a proof of my position. I cannot help you out of your hobble: But, I can assign you, the poetry professor at Oxford, and the public orator at Cambridge, as assistants, in the necessary work of mending your "cobbl'd rhymes."

From such rhymes, and such grammar, it was natural to expect, in the subsequent

(b) Priestly would have instructed you, (Horresco referens!) if you had looked into his grammar, that the verb to *shun* is not irregularly inflected: And see Ash's Dictionary *in voce*. *Once*, says Addison, signifies *formerly*; at a *former time*: Formerly *shun* will not do; but, formerly *shunned* will do. See how uniformly Addison preserves, in his *Campaign*, the consistency of his tense, in the present time:

"The rout begins, the Gallic squadrons run,

"Compell'd in crowds to meet the fate they shun."

verses,

verses, such obscurity, as to involve your readers in doubt, whether the *systems*, which laugh to *scorn the avenging rod*, be in the accusative case, or in the nominative (c). There can be no doubt, however, whether you introduce an anticlimax in your thirteenth verse, after making your *systems hurl defiance to the throne of God*, you sing, “*Blood* “*guiltiness* is their crime.” I say nothing of your pleonasm, in the same sentence, of *foliage dark, and cypress gloom*. But, how came you, in the preceding verse, to give *flesh* the power of thinking, by crying out; “*No flesh, no spirit, now must rest in* “*hope?*” In your *Mythology*, indeed, this new quality of matter often occurs, as in your thirtieth verse, you assign to your *Laurentian trumpet* not only a *sound*, but a *soul*. In this style of genuine nonsense, you talk, in your sixteenth verse, of *sculptur’d mockery*, as you speak of *mitr’d oath*; which oath cannot be ornamented with a *mitre* any more than *mockery* can be *sculptured*. Such

are the blunders in the first sixteen verses of a poem, which defies a commentary!

To obscurity, and nonsense, and pleonasm, you add an instance of false grammar, in your twenty-eighth verse:

"The loud Laurentian trumpet, through the land,

"Sound [sounds] &c. _____

"With strength of Stentor, but Mezentian soul (d)."

I am aware, that your assistants are ready to plead, that you meant to write, in the *subjunctive mood*, of which your writings proclaim your ignorance: But, the context shows, that you intended to speak *indicatively*: And, this is a proper example of the exception to the rule, which LOWTH lays down, when treating of the *subjunctive mood* (e). Of such verses, with their false grammar, and false sense, who is not ready to exclaim with a poet of a different spirit:

"Yet

(d) Pursuits, 7 Ed. p. 49.

(e) Grammar, p. 150-1: There is nothing *contingent*, or hypothetical, in the assertion, "though the Laurentian trumpet sound;" and, therefore, the *indicative mood* was requisite; as in the following example: "Though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor." [lb. p. 151.]

" Yet, this one maxim from my pen receive,

" To middling bards, the world no quarter give."

If such bards receive no quarter; if
" middling poets are by all accurst;"
what can that bard expect, who is often
incomprehensible, and generally nonsensical? But, is the first scholar, and the first
poet of the present day, ever incomprehensible, ever nonsensical? Yes:

" For, true *no-meaning* puzzles more than wit."

You may have examples, from any page of
the Pursuits, or *Shade of Pope*:

" Oh, for that Sabbath's dawn ere Britain wept,

" And France before the *Cross* believ'd and slept!

" (Rest to the State, and slumber to the soul!)

" Ere yet the brooding storm was heard to roll(f)."

Can *Geneva's angel* explain this incomprehensibility, except by a note, "without
" [an] end(g)?" Take a specimen of nonsense(h)?"

" Brave all the joint associates of A. S.

" The jest insipid, and the idle guess;

" Bind, copy, comment, *manuscript*, and print,

" Take from good natur'd friends some useful hint."

(f) *Pursuits*, 7 Ed. p. 275. (g) *Ib.* 6 Ed. p. 231-2.

(h) *Ib.* p. 104-5.

If we inquire for the sense ; if we ask, who ever saw, in any other place, the verb to *manuscript*? you will refer us to

“ Many a page in gorgeous *Bulmer's blaze* :”

But, if I had the art of *manuscripting*, in the highest perfection, I could neither *comment* upon one third of the improprieties of *your Pursuits*, nor copy half the errors in them :

“ Mark next, how fable, language, fancy, *flies* [fly]

“ To ghosts, and beards, and hoppergollops cries(i).”

Let us add another example of elegant poetry, and exact grammar, from *The Pair of Epistles* :

“ (Oh that their very names might *JOURDAN* throttle)

“ *Eisenach*, *Enrebrehtstein*, or *Wolfen-bottle*.

“ Such tempting themes *unwilling* [unwillingly] I forego,

“ Nor [not] strive to paint, what I can never know.”

We may now ask, a pointed question, with Roscommon :

“ Why is he honour'd with a Poet's name,

“ Who neither knows, nor would observe a rule?”

The answer is, if he cannot reason, he

(i) *Shade of Pope*, 3d Ed. p. 51-2.

can rhyme, both to the ear, and to the eye. Take from *the Pursuits*, as the best illustration, a few examples, which, in accuracy, emulate Gifford, and in *preciseness*, excel Pope:

Crachrode	-	God,
Fac similes	-	Fees,
Price	- - -	Clariss
Malone	- -	me all one,
Shewn	- - -	Malone,
A. S.	- - -	guest,
done	- - -	Alciphron,
eye	- - -	dignity
equal	- - -	the sequel
vie	- - -	dignity
rule	- - -	fool
priest	- - -	digest.
tint	- - -	point
view	- - -	too
new	- - -	too

These specimens, from a greater collection, may well induce you to confess, with BENEDICT, after he had made some indifferent verses: “very ominous endings! No; I was
“not born under a rhyming planet (k).”

I will

(k) I will add, from your *Odes*, your *Epistles*, and your *Pursuits*, some additional proofs of the truth of Bene-

I will now close my PROOFS, of your *inability* to write POETRY, with a few remarks on your *character of the favour'd BARD*,

dict's sentiment, and of the propriety of your adopting it:

East	- - -	dress
birth	- - -	earth
strew'd	- - -	food
store	- - -	pow'r
Sphere	- - -	disappear.
fraught	- - -	thought
cause	- - -	laws.
work	- - -	Burke
Pursuits	- - -	Puff in boots
own	- - -	alone
Rolle	- - -	Soul
search	- - -	Church
retire	- - -	Choir
again	- - -	men
loth	- - -	growth
turn	- - -	discern
horse	- - -	course.

It was such *ominous endings*, which, induced the clown, in *As you like it*, to observe: "I'll rhyme you so, eight
" years together, dinners and suppers, and sleeping
" hours, excepted: It is the right butter-woman's rate
" to market." I say nothing to your frequent sacrifice
of the grammar rule to the rhyme: As run—shun;
flies—cries; for *shunn'd, fly, &c.*

which

which was written by you with great elaboration, and has been praised by some critics, as excellent, beyond all praise.

Little need be said to your introduction, with "the dread resistless pow'r, that works *deep felt*," except, that your *deep felt* is not quite proper: Well: your favoured *Bard*, "with *loftier* soul, paints what he *feels*." *Loftier*, than what, or whom? Not surely than the foregoing "*dread resistless power*;" a comparison, which would be absurd, both in reason, and in rhyme. If there be neither poet, nor person, with whom your *Bard* can be compared, in your verses; then, your epithet, *loftier*, cannot be defended: There would not have been the same objection, if you had given your bard the *loftiest* soul. By leaving out two verses (1), in your last edition, in consequence of the objections of a

(1) "Paints what he feels in characters of light,

"Hears in each blast some consecrated rhyme,

"Trac'd by the spirit of the troublous clime."

Hears some consecrated rhyme trac'd! Through what
clime?

poet, you make your bard turn too quickly, after painting what he felt; and turn *without a mover*. "He turns: and *instantaneous*, all around, cliffs whiten, waters murmur, voices sound:" your adjective *instantaneous* will not agree with your verbs *whiten*, *murmur*, and *sound*: and it must, therefore, be *instantaneously*, or some other *adverb*, such as *instantly*, except, indeed, poetic license allows ungrammatical impropriety.

You go on to sing that oft your bard, "his steps ideal haste to rock *and* [or] groves, the wilderness *or* waste:" In verses, which arrogate *sublimity*, I say nothing to the *tautology* of groves, *wildernesses*, *wastes*. You now find a fit prototype for your *Bard*, in BRUNO, though not legitimate rhymes in *brow* and *below*, nor a proper accent in *sojourn*. "Then as down ragged cliffs the torrent roar'd, *prostrate* great nature's present God ador'd." *Prostrate adored* will not do, if an attention to grammatical rules be as necessary in poetry, as in prose: you must find an *adverb*,
instead

instead of an *adjective*, for your *verb*: Why not adopt *lowly*, which was used by MILTON, in your sense? Well: "The powers of harmony resort" to your bard, after he had been sadly frightened by your "substantial horrors, and [of] eternal doom." By your unskilfulness you now introduce such *flasky darknes* into the operations of your *musical powers*, that it is a hard task to find the grammatical connection, between the nominatives and verbs; "while to their numerous [number'd] pause, his choral passions dread accordance keep." Yet little is that obscurity, when compared with that "cloud of pride, which oft doth dark" the character of your bard; and oft doth urge your sublimity beyond the verge of sense: "Such is the *Poet*," say you: "bold without *con'sine* (*m*), imagination's character'd *libertine*." Your *con'sine*, if it were properly accented by you, is obnoxious to a charge of impropriety. Yes, your bard is without *con'sine*; for he can *ride* down a

(*m*) Pursuits, 7 Ed. p. 300.

tempestuous tide, while other poets must *sail* down such a tide: And you might as well have cheered the readers of this incomprehensible character, with this comfortable intimation from Dryden:

“ ’Twas ebbing darkness, past the noon of night,

“ And phosphor on the confines of the light.”

In this character of the *true Bard*, laboured into verse, I have now shewn, though it be short, many blunders. If one objection, which was drawn from an offence against poetic taste, rather than from rules of grammar, induced you to omit two verses, which were in the first delineation of this character, so many incontrovertible objections demand the expulsion of the whole character of the favorite Bard, from your *Pursuits*. I shall otherwise cry out, fy on the writer, and fy, fy, fy, on the critic; the one to scribble; the other to praise such “heroick fustian:

“ As, forc’d from wind guns lead itself can fly,

“ And pond’rous slugs cut swiftly thro’ the sky.”

PROOFS *that you* CANNOT WRITE *at all*.

He, who undertakes to write, in the English language, ought to write according to the rules of the grammar of that language: Hence follows another canon, that he must have a particular regard to *grammatical purity*. If, indeed, such an author should arrogate to himself the high character of being the *first scholar*, and the *first poet*, of the age, it becomes still more necessary that, in his compositions, he should be, not only, attentive to grammatical purity, but that he should add the higher qualities of elocution, which give energy, and grace, to his discourse.

I shall, in laying down my proofs, begin, as all grammarians begin, with the article. Although LOWTH has very ably explained the *use*, and the *application*, of the article; which is a prefix to substantives, for defining their significations; you seem not to know, that such a part of speech exists in our language. I will prove my position by examples: In [the] “advertisement to the 7th
“edition,” you say “*the* [my] Poem on the
“Pursuits

“Pursuits of Literature, I have *revised* with “*great care*,” and in this *revised* edition, p. 442, you say [the] “End of the Poem:” In these short, but remarkable, passages, are no fewer than three blunders. You talk of Dr. Douglas, [the] author; of Dr. Rennel, [the] author; of Dr. Gillies, [the] author; of the Rev. Mr. Nares, [the] Editor of the British Critic: As to Dr. Parr, indeed, you lament, when you think of such a scholar, and *the* [his] waste of erudition (*a*). As whipper-in, you mount Steevens in [the] rear, and “Calvin in [the] front.” In your avowed works, there is the same ignorance of the use of *the article* (*b*); a circumstance

(*a*) Pursuits, 6 Ed. p. 53.

(*b*) In your *Runic Odes*, may be seen, without the article; advertisement; argument. In your *Essay on Rowley*, may be observed, without the article: preface; contents; as to [the] metre, they are of opinion; as to [the] ancient language. [Essay, p. 66-7.] In your Pursuits, 7 Ed. p. 382, you sing of great statesmen, who:

“ ——— Some Mantuan strain rehearse,

“ In [a] *schoolboy* contest for a hackney’d verse.”

In the last verse, the judicious critic may see two blunders; the want of the article; and the no-adjective *schoolboy*.

this

this, which, with scholars, will be deemed a strong proof, that the same author only could commit the same blunders.

From the article, which, in our language, is so important, for giving clearness to the sense, and precision to the style, let us next advert to *the substantive, the name* of whatever is written, or conceived. I have already shown how much you confound the *noun* with the adjective, and the adjective with the noun. You have *sympostack* for *sympostarch*; you speak often of a *master* work, instead of a *masterly* work (*c*); of *master* misses (*d*); and you have more than once substituted *two* adjectives for *one* substantive; as *customary black, healing bland*. By the absurd practice of substituting a wrong noun for a right one, you often make downright nonsense of a sentence (*e*):

“ Soft;

(*c*) In your Odes, p. 24, you have committed the same fault, “ With *meteor* glare devoid of force:” As the proper adjective, MILTON had used *meteorous*.

(*d*) Pursuits, 7 Ed. p. 61.

(*e*) “ The sophists unabash’d yet rear their *head*.”
You thus give to Godwin, and to Volney, only *one*
“ *head*:

"Soft; and o'er *female failings* lightly pass;

"And may *Aglaia* lead them to *their glass*."

You, thus, lead up *female failings*, instead of the *fair sex*, to *their glass*. You place *con-nubial glories* on the head of *female failings*, which *female failings* you make to tread life's domestic, *happier*, stage; [happier than what?] and, by an Ovidian metamorphosis, you transform the said *female failings* into

"The guardians, comforts, teachers of mankind(f)."

By thus *rumbling in a storm of verse*, without attending to that important part of grammar, the *noun*, you ramble into manifest nonsense. I have already shown, that you attend as little to the true use of the *adjective*. Who ever saw such an adjective as *Straw-*

head: Now; the misfortune is, that they have two mischievous *heads*. [7 Ed. p. 368.] In a similar spirit of blunder, you speak of *one* Boaden; and *one* Waldron, who wrote *two* pamphlets. The fact is, that each of these Authors, who are full as well known, as a certain anonymous scribbler, wrote *one* pamphlet.

(f) I quote from the 7th Ed. of the *Pursuits*, p. 148, which Edition was *revised with great care*: By what poetic fiction, then, could you substitute *female failings* for the *fair sex*, through a dozen verses?

berry?

berry? Strawberry Horace (g); such an adjective as master? Master misses (h). After a thousand misapplications of the adjective, you "proclaim aloud the proletarian reign," by giving a new sense to this proletarian adjective, with proletarian blunder (i).

In

(g) None but yourself can be your parallel; You have your zig-zag verse; and *coxcomb strains*: In your Chinese Epistle, p. 13, there is *plume-pluckt*, and in p. 19, is *Anglo-Russic*: Add to these adjectives, *cryptogamik*, *tittle-tattle*, *battle-slain*, *gossamery*.

(h) For your *master misses*, you furnish proper companions, by giving them "pleasure misses," in your Chinese Epistle, p. 27. *Master misses*, and *pleasure misses*, may do well in China; but, they will not do in England!

(i) You quote Old Littelton for saying, "that *Proletarius* is a man who giveth nothing to the Common Wealth but only a supply of Children." [Pair of Epistles, p. 30.] Old Spelman knew neither that word, nor this signification of it. You quote, however, with your usual felicity, *Ennius*, and *Aulus Gellius*, on the point. The first scholar of the age would not, for the world, quote *Ainsworth* for *Proletarius*, poor, beggarly, vulgar; nor Johnson for *Proletarian*, in the same sense, who gives, as an example, from *Hudibras*, "*Proletarian* tything men." Neither would you condescend to adopt from Ash and Cole, *Proletaneous*, a numerous offspring:

In this same confusion of the parts of speech, you continually substitute the *adjective* for the *adverb*; as I have, already, shown, by a thousand examples (*k*): You write, indeed, as if you thought, that true poetry can exist with grammatical inaccuracy; and genuine wit be found in palpable blunder:

“ Oh, think not, master ! more true dullness lies

“ In Folly’s cap, than Wisdom’s grave disguise.”

Come we now to the *verb*, which is so significant in every sentence. I have already shown, in your works avowed, and disavowed, that you seem not to know either the value, or the use, in construction, of the verb (*l*). You appear, from your practice,

to
offspring: This, then, is the sense of your *Proletarian*; which very properly belongs to you: But, you would rather blunder, than borrow from such unlearned men, as Cole, and Ash.

(*k*) In your *Pursuits*, the 7th Edit. revised, p. 366, you have *loud* for *loudly*; *worthy* for *worthily*; and twice in the same note (*γ*), [6 Ed. p. 150] *chief* for *chiefly*.

(*l*) I will here subjoin a few additional examples of your ungrammatical practice: “ armies have skeletons,
 “ and

to know nothing at all of its subjunctive mood, although Lowth has fully explained

"and sermons too." This arrangement only conveys, that armies have both *skeletons* and *sermons*: But, your context required, that your *sermons* also should have skeletons. Again: "The life springs issue, and their force impart." Impart to what? Your active verb *impart* has no *second object*, which that verb requires. "When the reader *has* [shall have] considered." "Doctor Parr *will* [can] best explain." "I *could* [can] hardly please." In your *Essay on Rowley* you have been, remarkably, inattentive to the regimen of the verb: And I will particularize your errors, in this respect; in order that scholars may see the truth of my positions, namely, that you cannot write at all; and that the same person, who wrote the *Essay on Rowley*, also wrote the *Pursuits of Literature*. In p. 8, of the *Essay*, "the safety and well being of mankind *is*" [are]. In the same page, "the animosity and heat of any contest *is*" [are.] In p. 76, "the inflexion and orthography of words *is*" [are] In p. 82, "what have [has] now been laid before the reader." Compare with these blunders, which are not accidental, the following inaccuracies in your *Pursuits*: Your short address to the reader, which is prefixed to your 7th edition, has four blunders in it: It wants the article *the* in the first line; in the last paragraph, the subjunctive mood is disregarded; when you say, "if the poem is [be] read;" and your intimation,

its meaning, and its value: Of this position, I have already given some incidental proofs. I will here add a few more striking examples: "If Mr. Wakefield *does* [do] not

intimation, in the last clause, exhibits the verb in an ungrammatical form, when you add, "that the first dialogue *was* first published, in May, 1794, the *second* and *third* [was] in June, 1796, and the fourth in July, 1797: But, you could not grammatically apply a singular verb, either expressly, or virtually, to your *second*, and *third*, dialogues, not dialogue. We thus, in an address of two pages, perceive *four* blunders, which would of themselves show, that you cannot write. The multitude of errors, and the irregular forms of the verb, which, continually, occur in your introductory letter to this corrected edition, would demonstrate that position, if there were not a thousand other proofs. In p. vii you have, "If I *had* [had] any private end:" You subjoin, nonsensically, "if I *am* believed, I *am* believed:" "It" is neither Mr. Pitt, nor Lord Lansdown, nor Mr. Fox, nor Mr. Gray, who *are* [is] necessary to the "function:" [Purs. 6 Ed. p. 208.] The disjunctive *neither* requires the singular verb. You doubt, in 7 Ed. p. 83, "whether the drowsiness *and* gravity of Mr. Warton, and Mr. Steevens, *and* their brother-commentators *was* [were] in consequence:" If to write, blunderingly, be a sign of drowsiness, there can be no doubt, whether you *drowse*.

write.

" write. It is [were] devoutly to be wished.
 " Whether Mr. K. understands [understand].
 " If he is appointed [If he should be ap-
 " pointed]. Unless the province *is* [be] ad-
 " ministered, it is [it were] more desirable.
 " If it terminates [terminate]; if the end of
 " it *is* [be] intrigue; if the girls *are* [be]
 " debauched:" In these last examples we
 may see, that the sense is marred, by the
 ungrammatical construction. It is extremely
 remarkable, that the same ignorance of the
 subjunctive mood shews itself in all your
 writings, acknowledged, and not acknow-
 ledged: This fact, when corroborated, as it
 is, by other circumstances, must induce
 scholars to be of opinion, that the same pen,
 which thus betrays itself, scribbled them
 all (*m*).

Of those important parts of speech, the

(*m*) See your Pursuits, 6 Ed. 71, 72, 75, 77, 83, 107.
 &c. Essay on Rowley, p. 7, 9, 12, 53. Add to all the
 examples in the text, the following passage: " If Mr.
 " Pitt means [mean] that taxes should be an object
 " [objects] of wit." [Purs. 6 Ed. p. 165.] We have
 here, in a dozen words, *two* blunders.

T t

Preposition,

Preposition, the *Conjunction*, the *Interjection*. I will here say nothing; because, I have, incidentally, marked your inaccuracies in the use of them (*n*), in my notice of the other parts of speech of still greater consequence.

We have now seen, from a thousand instances, how far the *first scholar* of the age can write, with *grammatical purity*: Let us next examine, briefly, whether the *first poet* add to his other merits, as a writer, the higher qualities of elocution, which give energy, and grace, to his poetry, and prose. In every page of your *PURSUIITS*, you affect what grammarians have denominated, the *barbarism* (*o*): Both the *term*, and the reprobation

(*n*) You frequently use *or* for *and*; *or* for *nor*; *nor* for *or*; *do* for *do!*

(*o*) As you are a great dealer in *stale stuff*, so are you an extensive broker in *barbarisms*: You have *Borgo-allegro*, *Capriccio*, *extravaganza*, *nessa-bassa*, *armilustrum*, *excursus*, *ci-devant*, *escopetterie*, *diablerie*, *tennanto-phobia*, *ganinity*, *morosophists*, *conchetto*, *durandana*, *warkworthian*, *thelypthoric*, *Switzer-russico-Kamtschatcan*, *Morgu*, *Bofs*. I will add no more from a collection of a thousand

tion of the thing, we borrowed of the Greeks, who preserved their language, in its native purity, for so many centuries, by the contempt, which that learned, and elegant, people, constantly expressed, for the barbarism, and for their own writers, who presumed to affect such foreign terms.

You abound still more in another grammatical fault, called the *solecism*, which grammarians reprobate, with equal indignation; because the *solecism* shows greater ignorance, than the *barbarism*. I have already produced a thousand examples, which show, that you continually confound the adjective with the substantive, the adverb with the adjective, and the modes of the verb, the subjunctive, and the indicative, with each other.

To the *barbarism*, and the *solecism*, you frequently add the fault, which grammarians call *barbarisms*: Let Englishmen imitate the Greeks, in making a stand, for their language, against the lawless innovation of the *grecoised* affectation of a profligate pedant, who delights to *grecoise*.

nians reject under the name of *the impropriety* (p).

You abound, also, through all your writings, in a fault, not so much against the *purity* of grammar, as against the grace, and energy, of style: I mean a frequent repetition of unnecessary words, which is termed, by grammarians, *battology*, from a *proletarian* poet, called *Battus* (q). You have “*sum*, and *substance* (r); large, and abundant, stream (s); null, and void (t); all the year round (u); an abyss of darkness, and obscurity (x); pleasure and satisfaction (y);” with those examples of *battology*, from your *Essay on Rowley*, let us compare some instances, from your *Pursuits*; in order to identify the writer; “Code and

(p) You often blunder in substituting a wrong word for a right one; *Symposiacks* for *Sympocharchs*; *proletarian* for *proletaneous*; *twang* for *tang*; *enough* for *enow*; *naturalist* for *botanist*, &c.

(q) See *Bailey*, in *vo.*

(r) *Essay on Rowley*, Pref.

(s) *Ib.* p. 4. (t) *Ib.* p. 7. (u) *Ib.* p. 15. (x) *Ib.* p. 50.

(y) *Ib.* p. 117.

“ volume

TO T. J. MATHEIAS.] *For the* BELIEVERS. 645

" volume (z); name, stile, and title (a);
" Strawberry Horace on the hill (b); foliage
" dark, and cypress gloom (c); boyish days
" at school:" For this practice of batto-
logy, yourself shall assign an appropriate
reason; " a mighty and majestic river in its
" course through a diversity of countries not
" only winds and murmurs in the vallies,
" but contends and foams among rocks, and
" precipices, and the confluence of torrents.
" Still its tendency is to the ocean, to which
" it pays its last tribute, and is finally lost
" in that immensity (d):" Herein, you
out-gilpin Gilpin himself, whose appro-
priate style of topographical description, you
are studious to reprobate (e). Let me add
to those remarkable specimens, the opening
of your *Political Dramatist*:

" *The House was up; the long debate was o'er;*
" *And Addington presided now no more;*
" *Nor voice, nor vote along the benches crept,*
" *And corn committees bak'd their bread and slept;*

(z) 6 Ed. p. 195. (a) *Ib.* p. — (b) *Ib.* p. 35.

(c) *Ib.* p. 8. (d) *Ib.* p. 275. (e) *Ib.* p. 275.

(d) *Ib.* p. 221. (e) *Ib.* p. 275.

T : 3

" Somnus

"Somnus and Cereus no sage Members scorn,

"But own the poppy grows among the corn."

Who, indeed, can refrain from sleep, when such genuine *battology* is sung in *lullabies divine*: "the balm of Dulness trickling in their ears!" I will only add, that your readers may wake to hail thee,

"Th' immortal BATTUS of the present day."

"The last great prophet of tautology."

It is thus apparent, that you are sufficiently acquainted with the art of multiplying words; without, indeed, knowing the meaning, or the application of them: But, you know very little of the art of arranging words, so as to form a *sentence*. I have already submitted some proofs of this position: I will now only add a few examples. Take, as a singular instance, the conclusion of "Advertise-
ment to the seventh Edition of your Pur-
suits corrected," which is printed in the following manner: "It is remarkable; the
"Speaker was William Pitt; the Reporter,
"Samuel Johnson. No more." Can there be any writing more awkward, and ungram-
matical? The last sentence, consisting of only

two words, does not make any sense: For the two words, *no more*, standing thus insulated by themselves, have not the least meaning. Take another instance, from the Introductory Letter to the same corrected edition: "I offer the poetry to those who are conversant with the strength, simplicity and dignity of [the poetry of] Dryden and Pope, and [to] them alone. I submit both my poems, The Pursuits of Literature, and The Imperial Epistle," in this spirit [what spirit?] and with this confidence [what confidence?] to the public. There are men (and women too) who understand." Now, in this last sentence, thus insulated, by the full point, both before, and after it, there is not any compleat sense. True: It might be easily made compleat sense, by adding but two words: There are men, who understand *my object*. You afterwards say, in a separate sentence: "A little experience is sufficient for the observing." Here is no compleat sense: The observing what? You begin a subsequent paragraph thus: "I resume the reflections of suffering humanity and the

"*wreck of intellect*." This was not the ancient character of Philosophy." I say nothing either to the nonsense, or to the incoherence, of these nonsensical, and incoherent, sentences: But, I object to their want of any compleat sense, in support of my position, that you do not know how to arrange words, so as to form a sentence. (f)

In forming such sentences, your unskilful-

(f) Compare with the foregoing, the following examples from your *Essay on Rowley*; in order to establish the *universality* of your practice, in not forming compleat sentences: "A short disquisition, It is this, Whether superiority of genius, &c." [p. 97.] There is no sense in your three words, "It is this," pointed off, as they are, into a separate sentence. You afterwards begin, and end, a distinct paragraph thus [p. 113:] "That he was not ignorant of the French, Saxon and Latin tongues." In this whole paragraph there is not a compleat sentiment. You have a dozen other paragraphs, which are all equally defective. [p. 111-14.] It is easy to perceive, that the same pen, which scribbled the ill-constructed sentences, in your *Essay on Rowley*, also scribbled the ill-constructed sentences in your *Poems*, and in your *Chinese Epistle*, which, in p. 9, has the following imperfect sentence: "Perhaps some architects might conjecture by the help of a marine builder's dictionary."

ness was easily assisted by your affectation: and your ignorance of the necessary art of punctuation, readily effected what began in affectation, and ended in unskillfulness. I have already shewn, by examples, that you do not understand the purpose, and use of the *Comma*; because you interpose it, sometimes, between the subject, and the verb to which it relates. You constantly confound the semicolon [;] with the colon [:] and this last with the period [.]: In truth, your continued blunders, in this last respect, have perplexed your grammatical construction, and have made downright nonsense of many of your sentences. You have, in all your writings, both in the acknowledged, and the unacknowledged, confounded the point of interrogation with the point of interjection; and, sometimes, the comma with both.

I will here close my PROOFS, that you cannot write at all: and they are decisive, because I have seldom failed to exemplify every objection by some apt quotation from your writings. The judicious few, who may have honoured these proofs with their attention,

tions will be tempted to exclaim with the poets,

"Write, then, and still write on, no matter why,
Nor what, nor how; so Baskin will but buy!"

THE CONCLUSION

I have now finished what I proposed to say concerning your Pursuits, under three several Heads. Knowing neither you, nor your writings, I did not step out of my way to meddle with either; but you came to me, and offered personal insult, in the language of defiance. I have plucked off your "vain mask;" I have looked at your bare face; I have examined your boastful scribble. But, to such a body of heterogeneous matter, whether imported from Bœotia, or from Botany-Bay, it is hard to give a name; and of such a mingled mass, it is still more difficult to give an analysis. All mixed bodies take their names from the predominance of some particular substance in them, either good, or bad. The standard of our gold coins is in the proportion of eleven parts of gold, to one part of alloy: Your Blackmail consists, as

the

the trial of *the* *piece* has proved, of eleven parts of alloy, and one part of gold; and may well be denominated, in the language of our assayers, "*dröfs* unclean." Until, however, our Chymists shall have examined, by appropriate experiments, this non-descript congeries, in order to ascertain its nature, and to assign it a name, from its prevailing quality, I shall call this vast volume of scribble, by the well-known denomination of BALDERDASH: For, in the anticipating couplet of Pope:

"So all your prose, and verse, are much the same;

"This prose on stilts, that, poetry fall'n lame."

Yet; as it is the boast of modern discoveries to find some thing useful in the meanest matter, so in your balderdash may be found some use. A volume of 444 pages, for 8s. 6d. may appear, at first sight, to be rather dear; considering that it is not illuminated by *Bulmer's blaze*. But, when the teachers of our youth shall consider, that they are now provided in one volume, although at a great expence, with *every possible specimen of bad writing*, which may be put before

before their pupils, as examples of the errors of writings, that are at once sophistical in argument, and ungrammatical in style, I trust the said teachers will be of opinion, that they have, at last, a good bargain in your Pursuits:

"Yet, if by chance, you here and there impart

"Some sparks of wit, or glimmerings of art;

"If, by mistake, you blunder upon sense,

"Good nature will forgive the first offence."

Amidst the vastness, and variety, of your learning, you appear to have forgotten an adage of Terence, which, when you sat down to write lampoon, ought to have been hung up before your eyes: *Quique vult dicere, que non vult audire*; or, in the language of our great-great-grand-mothers, "He, that speaketh what he will, shall hear what he will not." You have provided, by your assumed invisibility, that you shall not be seen: Whether you have provided, equally, by deafness, that you shall not hear, I know not. Whatever may be your coat of darkness, it has not wholly concealed you from my ken: Whatever may be your malady of not marking, like Falstaff's, I will say, as the

Chief

Chief Justice said to the Knight, who had playfulness, without malignity, "to punish you by the heels would amend the attention of your ears." Yet, whether you speak, or whether you be silent, is to me a matter of indifference. From your *Essay on Rowley*, I have learned, that "to reason is one thing; to joke is another; that Truth has at all times defied the power of ridicule (1):" Like other men, who attack without provocation, and announce answers, without any purpose of publishing them, you may think of taking up the hard task of *fully answering* unanswerable objections. It may assist your determination to be told, that, in addition to the thousand errors, which I have now pointed out in your poetry, and prose, I have in reserve a hundred pages of manifest blunders, which I incidentally collected, as I went through your *Pursuits*; and which an intimation of a wish from you would induce me to send to the press, as a warning to our youth, when they may in-

(1) *Essay on Rowley*, p. 51-2.

cline

cline to commence authors, not to look for examples of good writing, into your Pursuits. Meantime, I will take the liberty, at parting, of offering you DRYDEN's whole some advice,

"Learn to write well, or not to write at all; and of inculcating upon you the valuable maxim of POPE.

"Let such teach others, who themselves excel;

"And censure freely, who have written well."

THE END.



ERRATA,

In the APOLOGY:

Page 171, del. the (,) between *accuser* and *is*.

187, the *three proper letters*, which were attributed to Spenser, were written by Gabriel Harvey;

191, *Gayarum* for *Grayarum*.

— *woe* for *woo*.

217, *Emanuel* for *Magdalen*.

252, *heeps* for *keeps*.

255, 1 Ed. of Camden's *Rem.* in 1605 for 1614.

259, *is* for *are*.

264, *enough* for *enow*.

286, *Romeo and Juliet* is quoted instead of *Hamlet*.

294, *Underhill* for *Underwood*.

318, del. the quotation of *all our hills*, from *Timon*

of *Athens*.

353, *a* for *an*.

369, *are* for *is*.

— *have* for *has*.

413, *Abbot* for *Lord* of *Misrule*.

421, *Rym. Foed. pub.* in 1705 for 1715.

425, 1744 for 1742.

456, *Cambrige* for *Cambridge*.

470, 1763 for 1752.

472, *belongs* for *belong*.

474, *ravel-rout* for *revel rout*.

476, *was* for *were*.

523, *Warwickshire* for *Worcestershire*.

589, *Hand and hand* for *Hand in hand*.

ERRATA,

In the SUPPLEMENTAL APOLOGY:

Page 52, iduuced for induced.

82, may for many.

153, aprentage for parentage.

545, Primatif for Primitif.

619, con-consistent for consistent.

In Pages 389, 395, 402, 413, 419, 422, 430, 432, 434, 438, and 446, the plays should have been numbered ~~one~~ forwarder; XXII should have been XXIII. &c.